

Concordia *Theological Monthly*

Vol. XIV

JANUARY, 1943

No. 1

Foreword

Another year arrives, and what a hapless, disjointed, sad, disillusioned world it looks upon! Nation slaughters nation; the globe resembles one huge shambles; civilization apparently is collapsing, the social order disintegrating; the noble inventions and discoveries of science are harnessed to the chariot of destruction and death; the ingenuity of statesmen stands discredited; education has led downward; mankind may be compared to a large monster which is gnawing at its own vitals. Those whose eyes have not been entirely dimmed can plainly discern the seven angels pouring out the vials of divine wrath on the earth.

As the attempt is made to determine the causes of these lamentable conditions, it is often stated that the churches have been remiss in the performance of their mission, otherwise these catastrophes would never have come to pass. We shall not discuss the charge except to say that clearly the social gospel preaching which has been the vogue in many churches during the last three decades has proved entirely impotent for the curbing of the elemental passions of man, greed, selfishness, hatred, the lust for power. A stronger force than honeyed morality discourses is needed if the human tiger is to be restrained. We shall furthermore admit that undoubtedly we Christians have failed to assert ourselves as manfully as we should have done in our efforts to act as the salt of the earth and the light of the world. Everyone of us will have to bear his share of the guilt that is assessed against the disciples of Jesus Christ these days. May the unprecedented calamities from which we suffer be regarded as a loud call to repentance by all of us!

In the confusion which reigns on all sides the cry is raised with much insistence that to prevent the recurrence of such widespread bloodshed and internecine strife and to rebuild the shattered world, the churches will have to unite. If the churches

have been powerless in the past, the cause, so it is stated, must, at least in part, be sought in the divided state of Christendom. In England no less a person than the Archbishop of Canterbury has proposed that a committee representing all Christian churches be formed in which the Pope is to be the chairman, which is to assay the task of putting the world's house in order.

In our own country the sentiment which favors the uniting of churches is quite strong, and we see that some church bodies are actually engaged in effecting mergers. Committees are at work to bring about a union of the Congregational and Christian Churches with the Evangelical and Reformed Church. Two other church bodies making plans to unite are the United Brethren and the Evangelical Church (Albright Brethren). The argument which furnishes the foundation for these efforts is, of course, the old slogan "In union there is strength."

The chief developments dealing with union movements among Lutheran bodies have regularly been reported on in our Observer section. A factor which has focused general attention in America on the Lutheran camp and the views held there on the uniting of churches has been the invitation of the Federal Council of Churches addressed to the U. L. C. A. to change the status of its relations to the Federal Council from one of a consultative nature to that of full membership. The daily press, and among prominent religious journals the *Christian Century*, took notice of this invitation and the debates engendered thereby. A lengthy editorial in the latter paper with the heading "Lutheran Isolation" dwelt on the positions of the various Lutheran synods and evaluated them from its own point of view. The CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, though always advocating the establishment of fellowship among the various Lutheran bodies if the right foundation for such action can be achieved, has consistently opposed every union which was not based on unity of doctrine. We may well in this Foreword ask ourselves whether the arguments and considerations which the *Christian Century* advances compel us to modify our position.

The editorial in question is too long to be reprinted here, and we shall have to content ourselves with summarizing the views it contains. The chief thoughts expressed there appear to us to be these: The faith which the Lutheran Church stands for is beginning to be reaffirmed in the other Protestant churches — a sign that Lutheran teaching embodies essential truths. It would be a fallacy to think that the preservation of these truths necessitates isolation. They can be more effectively maintained and imparted to others through fellowship rather than through a separate stand of their exponents. That American Protestantism

is returning to the faith of the Reformation is not due to the efforts of the Lutherans in America, but to the work of Barth, Brunner, Nygren, Kierkegaard, Visser 't Hooft, Keller, and many others. American Lutherans cannot claim credit for it. Hence past experiences do not justify the continuation of such a policy of isolation; the good which it is hoped isolation will produce was not accomplished by it in the past. If it is thought that acceptance of full membership in the Federal Council on the part of the U. L. C. A. will make it more difficult for that body to enter into fellowship with other Lutheran synods, that consideration will probably hold with respect to the "extreme conservatives" of the Missouri and Wisconsin Synods. But these bodies will hardly be willing to establish union on any basis whatever. "They represent more recent waves of immigration, and at the present rate of progress it will take another generation or two before they become sufficiently indigenous to American culture for them to trust themselves in the warmth of fellowship which American Christianity affords." That membership in the Federal Council will not hurt the cause of Lutheran unity was demonstrated by the offer of pulpit and altar fellowship made to the U. L. C. A. by the A. L. C. without the stipulation that the U. L. C. A. would have to keep out of the Federal Council if the fellowship was to become a reality. The proposal made by the A. L. C. of a Lutheran convention in which all synods will be represented points in the same direction. The Augustana Synod may even accept full membership in the Federal Council before the U. L. C. A. does. The three bodies just mentioned (the U. L. C. A., the A. L. C., and the Augustana Synod) represent two thirds of the Lutherans in America. They co-operate with each other and with several other Lutheran bodies in the National Lutheran Council. If the U. L. C. A. joins the Federal Council of Churches, the other bodies are sure to follow.

We have tried to present a fair digest of the views of the editor of the *Christian Century*. Surveying them, one finds that they do not contain much that can be called argument. Perhaps most striking is the assertion that while American Protestantism is moving more closely toward the Lutheran position, the credit for this *rapprochement* belongs to European writers, not to the efforts of American Lutheran theologians and bodies. Have American Protestant churches actually been approaching the Lutheran position? There has become evident some disillusionment with respect to the social gospel, that is true. There has been a drift toward the views sponsored by Barth and Brunner, to mention only the two men that are best known among the theologians enumerated in the *Christian Century* editorial. But their positions cannot be called Lutheran. They are more conservative than

the positions held by many preachers and teachers in our country, inasmuch as they insist on the teaching of doctrine. But Barth and Brunner are not Lutheran; they are Reformed in their fundamental views. That Lutheran writers and speakers have not exerted much influence on the most publicized currents of theological thought in this country may be true. There have not been Lutheran teachers of theology whose works have been sold as widely as, let us say, the works of Fosdick and Shailer Mathews and other Modernists. But we can say that in the Lutheran Hour, on which Dr. W. A. Maier is the speaker, we have an agency which is certainly helping greatly in molding the thought of preachers and Christian laymen outside the Lutheran Church. If Lutheran books have not had the vogue that those of the writers of other denominations have had, the reason largely is that Lutheran books have taken the conservative point of view, which has interfered with their popularity, though not with their usefulness in their special sphere. The Lutheran Church in America, counting the members of all synods, now numbers about five million people. Even if the influence of the Lutheran Church does not extend beyond the sphere of these five million people (which, of course, we do not admit), it has made a remarkable impact on American life. No movement that numbers so many adherents can be said to be of slight significance. We are here, as will be perceived, arguing merely from the premises of the *Christian Century* and not endorsing the thought that seems implied, that a Church which desires to fulfill its mission must seek to be a body which exerts a strong, noticeable influence on the people about it. Every Church which is loyal to the teachings of the Scriptures will exert an influence. But let us not forget that this influence is rather a by-product, not the primary objective. The Church's mission is to preach the Gospel. The results it should and may safely leave to the Head of the Church.

The *Christian Century* argues that the truths which Lutheranism possesses will not suffer if the Lutheran synods enter the Federal Council of Churches. Is that true? Let the reader visualize what full membership in the Federal Council implies! The Lutheran, believing sincerely the truths set forth in his confessional writings, has to join hands and practice fellowship, for instance, with the Auburn Affirmationists, claiming the right to deny the inerrancy of the Scriptures, the virgin birth of Christ, our Lord's substitutionary atonement, the actuality of His bodily resurrection, and the reality of His miracles. With people of this type he is to work together in a fraternal way. He abhors what they stand for, but he has to be their brother and co-operate with them in spiritual enterprises. What becomes of

truthfulness, what of sincerity? To one who does not look upon these things as sacred truths but merely as human opinions which may be right or wrong such fellowship does not give any concern. But it certainly must be different with one who looks upon these matters as teachings coming from God Himself and who regards them as the base for his hope of everlasting life. How can he be in the same camp with people who tread these precious things under foot? If he does stay in such a fold, his own sense of what is true will be blunted, and gradually he will descend to the level of these Affirmationists.

The *Christian Century's* position that the truth can be safeguarded and maintained better in fellowship than in a status of isolation is tenable only if the fellowship conceived of here is of the right kind, a fellowship with people who are eager to bow to everything the Scriptures say and to look upon Jesus as their divine Redeemer. But what of a fellowship in which by many members the divine Word is not acknowledged to be the only source of religious truth, in which, moreover, the Bible is considered a book of errors and the doctrine of the substitutionary atonement of Jesus is regarded as a superstition? That in such an atmosphere the salient Gospel truths will prosper and become increasingly powerful is hard to believe.

We have full confidence in the divine power which dwells in the Word of God. We believe that where it is spoken, the Holy Spirit is tugging at the heartstrings of people to exert His benign influence. We believe, furthermore, that this Word should be disseminated as far and as widely as is possible. If in the meetings of the Federal Council of Churches the Gospel truths are uttered, we rejoice. But whoever becomes a member of the Federal Council of Churches signs articles of friendship and amity with opponents of the Gospel truths and thus in advance creates conditions unfavorable for a full, unhampered testimony to the truth.

To all this must be added the consideration, not adverted to by the *Christian Century*, that in striking up an alliance with avowed enemies of definite articles of the Christian faith one is denying Christ and His holy Word. One is establishing fraternal relations with a number of people whom a conservative Lutheran cannot conscientiously regard as brethren. Their case is not that of weak Christians who accept all the fundamental teachings of the Word and who through ignorance are still in error on one or the other non-fundamental point of Christian doctrine. What these people reject are fundamental teachings of the Word. In fact, by rejecting the inerrancy of the Scriptures they destroy the foundation on which the Christian faith rests. How can a conscientious Lutheran enter into fellowship with them without

denying his heavenly Lord? "No one can serve two masters."
"He that is not with Me is against Me."

What has been stated above will, of course, not make much of an impression on the *Christian Century* editor and all those that share his position. They will classify it as coming from one of the "extreme conservatives of the Missouri and Wisconsin Synods" and pay no further attention to it. But their disapproval must not influence us. Whether men regard our teachings as outmoded, anachronistic, antiquated, wrong, and untenable, or not, is not the important matter. The query which fills every child of God with awe is whether loyalty is shown to the holy Scriptures and to Christ Crucified, who is their center.

In referring to the attitude of the A. L. C. and its offer of fellowship to the U. L. C. A., the editor of the *Christian Century* hardly is sufficiently informed to evaluate correctly all that is involved. He does not seem to be aware of the words in the A. L. C. resolutions in which fellowship with the U. L. C. A. is made contingent on full, wholehearted acceptance of, and adherence to, the Pittsburgh Agreement on the part of the U. L. C. A. It is a proviso which has not yet been complied with. We hope the A. L. C. will not allow this clause to be disregarded. If without insistence on such compliance the A. L. C., listening to the urgings of its liberal wing, will declare pulpit and altar fellowship with the U. L. C. A., conservative Lutheranism will receive a severe blow. Such a move will mean the eventual absorption of the A. L. C. in the U. L. C. A., if not organically, then at least ideologically and theologically. If that should come to pass, we should sincerely regret it. Not only should we consider such a course a violation of divine directives, but we believe that both historically and on account of the convictions of many of its members the A. L. C. does not belong in the liberal camp of Lutherans. We, however, much though we should like to establish fellowship with the A. L. C., could not on that account change our own course and likewise become a liberal Lutheran body, condoning or approving tacitly the membership of many pastors of the U. L. C. A. in the Masonic lodge, the almost indiscriminate pulpit and altar fellowship practiced by many U. L. C. A. churches with sectarian congregations, and the denial of the inerrancy of the Scriptures which is voiced by prominent U. L. C. A. theologians. There might be "warmth" in such a broad fellowship, but that would be entirely offset by the icy coldness in our hearts caused by the voice of conscience accusing us of having become unfaithful to our trust and of having denied our Savior.

An issue of an altogether different nature confronts one when the question of participation in a free conference or convention of

Lutherans arises. The illustrious ancestor of our CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, *Lehre und Wehre*, eloquently sponsored the cause of free conferences, and when one of its friends in Europe, Lic. Stroebe, criticized the undertaking and characterized it as an unwarranted attempt to aid God in His work of spreading the Church, *Lehre und Wehre* replied with spirit and vigor and asserted that it could not conceive of anything more God-pleasing than the gathering of sincere adherents of Lutheranism convened in the fear of God to remove the misunderstandings and differences that divided the Church. We strongly favor the continuance of free conferences where they have been held and their inauguration in sections where they have not yet been instituted. It need hardly be emphasized that they must remain free conferences and not become organizations presupposing fellowship. Let the divine teachings of the Scriptures as set forth in the Lutheran Confessions be studied at such conferences. The object should not be in the first place to unite the synods, but to see jointly what rich treasures our dear Lutheran Church possesses in the doctrinal heritage which Luther and other God-given leaders have bequeathed to us. In that way unity will quietly, unobtrusively develop and finally, if it please God, find expression in the attitude of the synods toward one another.

To sum up: Lutheran isolation will have to continue as long as the church bodies about us, and especially the Federal Council of Churches, deny fundamental teachings of the Holy Scriptures. In their own camp let Lutherans endeavor through earnest discussions to remove the doctrinal differences which now keep them apart and which cannot be ignored if the truths revealed in the Scriptures are to be maintained and handed down to posterity. Such a course, though it involves debates and controversy, will be more blessed for the Church than the establishment of outward solidarity accompanied in some sections by inward strife and bickerings, and in others by a complete doctrinal coma and indifference. "Now, the Lord of peace Himself give you peace always by all means. The Lord be with you." 2 Thess. 3:16.

W. ARNDT



Toward a Lutheran Philosophy of Education

(This is a revised and extended version of an essay read in one of the plenary meetings of the Board for Higher Education, which convened in Milwaukee July 26—29. It is herewith submitted by request.

I am deeply grateful to Prof. Nelson B. Henry of the University of Chicago, secretary-treasurer of The National Society for the Study of Education, for having granted me written permission to quote pertinent passages from the *Yearbook*.—P. B.)

This is not the first attempt in our circles to approach the subject of "a Lutheran philosophy of education." Every committee of Synod which was charged with the task to examine and, by helpful suggestions, to improve our program of higher education has, with varying degrees of comprehensiveness, articulated our philosophy of education. Especially is this true of the work done by Synod's recent "Curriculum Committees," which laid down guiding objectives of education in their reports on our junior colleges, theological seminaries, and teachers colleges, and called attention to the peculiar place of our system of higher education in the American scene. On the elementary level, materials published by the Board of Christian Education have also defined our position in education and laid down aims and objectives. I should call special attention to the *Curriculums* published by our men in the teaching profession, in which objectives and activities are thoroughly presented. Other materials published here and there in our circles have also dealt with some phase or other of the vast subject of a Lutheran philosophy of education. Of special significance I regard the essay which your secretary, President O. P. Kretzmann, read before this body a year and a half ago (meeting of Jan. 17—19, 1940) and titled "A Lutheran Philosophy of Education." In this excellent paper, Dr. Kretzmann analyzed briefly the principles underlying Protestant or secular, totalitarian, Roman Catholic, and Lutheran education, and appended a number of significant conclusions for consideration by this group. There appeared also a little more than a year ago in the *Journal of Theology of the American Lutheran Conference* a notable article on the Lutheran philosophy of education by Prof. W. P. Hieronymus under the caption "A Philosophy of Christian Education in the Lutheran Church."

Nevertheless it does not seem out of place to present another paper on the subject, the immediate occasion being the appearance several months ago (February) of the *Forty-First Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, Part I of which presents five current philosophies of education. Though some of these philosophies take into account chiefly the elementary level of American education, the basic metaphysical assumptions of

all of them have a direct bearing on higher levels of education as well. The historical overview was contributed by Prof. E. H. Reisner of Columbia and the critical and comparative analysis by Prof. John S. Brubacher of Yale. The titles and authors of the five philosophies represented in the *Yearbook* are:

1. *Philosophy of Education from the Experimentalist Outlook*, by William H. Kilpatrick (prof. emer., Columbia).
2. *Education and the Realistic Outlook*, by Frederick S. Breed (University of Chicago).
3. *An Idealistic Philosophy of Education*, by Herman H. Horne (New York University).
4. *In Defense of the Philosophy of Education*, by Mortimer J. Adler (University of Chicago).
5. *The Philosophy of Catholic Education*, by William McGucken, S. J. (St. Louis University).

By way of general comments on the *Yearbook* I should like to say:

1. A year and a half ago Prof. L. Bickel of Seward called attention to the fact that the N. S. S. E. was planning this *Yearbook*. Professor Bickel, Prof. F. E. Mayer, myself, and others considered what might be done to have our views on education represented in this *Yearbook*. We had Prof. A. Haentzschel from Valparaiso University draw up a brief statement. This was sent to Prof. J. S. Brubacher, chairman of the Society's Committee on Philosophies of Education. After some days we received from Professor Brubacher a reply to the effect that our views represented a denominational approach and that if the Committee were to incorporate them in the *Yearbook*, "other Protestant sects would have to be taken in," obviously, as Professor Haentzschel later remarked, "a poor argument since no other Protestant body does any parochial school work worth mentioning." In short, inclusion of a Lutheran philosophy of education in the *Yearbook* was not granted by Professor Brubacher. This body might give some thought to this situation and its implications.

2. The *Yearbook* failed to take note of other folks. It does not contain a philosophy of vocational training. The fact is that in 1938 an annual enrollment of 2,000,000 pupils in vocational classes out of a total of 6,000,000 in all types of classes in the public high schools was officially reported. Without a doubt the expanding system of vocational training is definitely encouraging a dual system of schools and a separation of the vocational from the cultural schools. Neither is the Worker's Education Movement, which is sponsored by American Labor groups and which educates tens of thousands of Americans, represented in the *Yearbook*.

3. We regret, finally, that the *Yearbook*, though it touches on the problem of higher education analyzed by President Robert Hutchins in his *The Higher Learning in America* does not anywhere subject this problem and the solution suggested by President Hutchins to a critical analysis.

But in spite of these omissions, *Part I* of the *Forty-First Yearbook* offers a mine of information on current philosophical thought in education. Unquestionably this *Yearbook* will receive considerable attention and be regarded a valuable depository of philosophical views on education distinctive of our day and age.

In my paper I shall attempt to do the following:

I. Present a résumé of the philosophies of education published in the *Yearbook*.

II. Present briefly the historical and educational background which the philosophies of education presented in the *Yearbook* body forth.

III. Present a theory of a Lutheran philosophy of education.

I. Résumé of the Philosophies of Education Published in the *Yearbook*

A. *Philosophy of Education from the Experimentalist Outlook*, by William H. Kilpatrick

Professor Kilpatrick needs no introduction. "Aside from overthrowing the orthodoxies of theology and mathematics, Professor Kilpatrick has challenged most educational theory on pragmatic premises. . . . He is author, joint author, and editor of some of the most provocative books in American education." (John T. Wahlquist, *The Philosophy of American Education*. New York, 1942, p. 387.)

Professor Kilpatrick's contribution to the *Yearbook* represents the pragmatic point of view in education. It is obviously impossible in this brief essay to present a detailed account of his views. We must confine ourselves to essentials. After defining the scope and purpose of the philosophy of education as well as the meaning of education, Professor Kilpatrick discusses the world of experience. He believes that there is such a thing as knowledge as opposed to opinion. This knowledge is achieved and grows purely out of experience, that is, out of the continuous interaction between the organism and the environment, or the person and the situation. Mankind has over a period of many years accumulated a vast store of knowledge. But only in comparatively recent times (the Greeks made the start, the scientists of the Renaissance continued where the Greeks left off) did man come to view all knowledge critically. Thus there has come into existence experimental science. The findings of experimental science are, however, never

final and absolute, but are always open to revision. The method of experimental science, so Professor Kilpatrick further believes, should be applied to all forms of human education, not only to tangible data of observation. This experimental method is the pragmatic method. It rests on three conceptions:

1. Ideas mean only their consequences in experience;
2. Experience is essentially social in origin and predominantly social in purpose;
3. We find out what to expect in life by studying experimentally the uniformities within experience.

This method the educator should apply also to morals. There are implicit, so Professor Kilpatrick believes, in children the beginnings of a goodly number of ethical conceptions, such as regard for others, fair play, etc. Though he admits that human nature provides a certain initial endowment of intelligence and susceptibility to action, he does not seem to be clear regarding the source of the child's moral conceptions. We therefore ask: Are these conceptions purely the result of interaction between the child and environment, or are they, at least basically, innate? And if innate, are they survivals of an evolutionary process in which man in course of time developed higher and higher standards of moral living, or are they innate in the sense that they are reflections of the Moral Law which God at creation wrote into man's heart? By means of the pragmatic method, so Professor Kilpatrick continues, the educator trains children to regard others, to develop an attitude of responsibility, and to assume obligations. But how will the child decide which of two or more possible actions in a given moral situation is of greater moral worth? Here Professor Kilpatrick falls back on Dewey's five steps of experimental thinking (see John Dewey, *How We Think*, first chapters). Professor Kilpatrick's principles of ethics are the following (note that they are largely Kantian both in form and content. One is led to exclaim: Kant and Kilpatrick, what a combination!):

1. Each person is to be treated always as *end* and never merely as means. In this ethical respect all men are to stand equal.
2. Conversely, each person is under moral obligation so to act as, negatively, not to hurt the good life of others and, positively, to foster the good life of all.
3. The more honestly and carefully study is carried on by different individuals and groups, the more likely will they reach like results.
4. The free play of intelligence stands as our final resource to tell us what to do — intelligence playing freely upon experience in any and all of its content, including the use of intelligence itself. (Note: Professor Kilpatrick acknowledges no higher authority than reason to tell man what to do in a given moral situation.)

5. We know no absolute principles; that is, none which now stand properly above criticism or which may not conceivably be modified, perhaps in intent, perhaps in application, as new conditions arise. (Note: Moral standards are relative and have no fixed stars!)

6. From all the foregoing, democracy follows as the effort to run society on the combined basis of the good life and ethics, as these are managed co-operatively by the members themselves.

Professor Kilpatrick next enlarges on the concept "group culture." There is such a thing as group culture, a social heritage. The child becomes acquainted with this culture at a very early age through experience. But because present society is dynamic and no longer static as it was, so Professor Kilpatrick argues, only a few decades ago, schools have a much greater task and duty to perform in the way of having the child experience this culture than they did years ago. Schools must especially build social intelligence. "We have in the past century or two built and spread scientific intelligence. We must next build social intelligence and spread it effectively among our people" (p. 66).

The discussion of group culture is followed by an analysis of the learning process and the work of the school. Professor Kilpatrick, who has consistently in his educational career emphasized the importance of activity in the learning process (he is the strongest enthusiast of the project method), also in this article stresses learning by doing. He analyzes the learning process as follows: Each child learns what he lives; he learns it as he accepts it in his own heart to act on; he learns it in the degree that it is important to him and in the degree that it has meaningful connections with what he already knows; what he learns he builds at once into character (p. 69). Professor Kilpatrick advocates a type of school where "living goes on, the best and finest type of living we can help our young people to create" (p. 74). "The activity schools show as good subject-matter knowledge and skills as do the old. For my own part, I think the new type school should do better at the defensible old line skills" (p. 76).

What about the curriculum? Professor Kilpatrick defines the curriculum as "the whole living of the pupils or students so far as the school accepts responsibility for its quality" (p. 76). He believes in an emerging curriculum. "In the sense formerly understood by subject-matter requirements there is not much that I should care to name in advance that must in the end be learned, and still less should I wish to state when it will be learned. I know that there is a considerable body of common knowledge and common skills that any decently educated group will show; but I don't believe that naming this body in advance is the helpful way to begin" (p. 77). "I would use no textbooks as such, but

instead all sorts of reference books. Many of these would need to be prepared for varying age levels. I would give no marks in either elementary or secondary school, and send no regular report cards, especially of a kind intended to compare one pupil with another. I think all such seriously hinder the kind of living the schools exist to foster" (p. 78).

Professor Kilpatrick concludes his philosophy of education with a chapter titled "Education and the Improving of Life in Society." He discusses the relation of the individual to society, the nature of the economic problem ("a system that can produce more than it can dispose of, and yet leaves millions stranded—such a system cannot be defended," p. 82), common dependence, common responsibility, and the obligations which rest on education for improving the life of society. His optimistic outlook leads him to say, "If the schools will do their part, we can hope for a great increase in social intelligence among our people. Already it seems true that a larger proportion of our people are studying and thinking than ever before" (p. 84).

We are concluding our brief analysis of Professor Kilpatrick's philosophy of education with the following summary:

1. Education being due to the interaction of the organism with the environment must promote such interaction.

2. The method to be employed by educational philosophy should be that of science.

3. There is knowledge (as opposed to opinion) of some sort, but this knowledge is of a precarious character, due to the novelly emerging universe. There are no absolute principles, no fixed stars. "In a future that is more or less uncertain, Professor Kilpatrick finds whatever stability there is in his experimental method and in whatever store of already tested experience it has been able to accumulate" (criticism by Professor Brubacher, pp. 299, 300).

4. Professor Kilpatrick's principles on morals are largely Kantian both in form and content.

5. Moral education is the product of social experience.

6. The self is a social product; nature provides, however, a certain native endowment of intelligence and susceptibility to action.

7. Good is what satisfies the organism's cravings; therefore the good is a subjective and relative thing. Intelligence must decide which of two or more goods one should prefer and strive to achieve.

8. The aim of education should be: The child should learn, to live the life of the group and accept appropriate responsibilities therewith. Here Professor Kilpatrick's analysis of human behavior, which in many respects is penetrating indeed, breaks down woe-fully because he optimistically assumes that, as a result of moral education, the naturally self-centered individual will in a given conflict between self and group deny his ego and submerge it in the interest of the group. It is the same tragic mistake which

is always made by natural man who does not know that the power of the Gospel, and the power of the Gospel alone, is able to move a hardhearted self-centered sinner to deny himself in the interest of the group. The writer of the following quotation, for instance, has no solution for the problem which he so clearly defines:

"Our problem is today what it was of old: the art of combining independence and co-operation. Without independence, man misses his highest political development, his dignity as man, his creative power; without co-operation, his independence becomes selfish, his creativeness sterile, his sentiment a source of strife and misunderstanding. It is in the harmonization of these two principles that true freedom rests." (*The Contemporary Review*, July, 1942, p. 48.)

9. Schools should be activity schools.

10. Schools must play their part in the improvement of society.

11. The child is superior to the State (opposed to the Aristotelian and the totalitarian point of view).

B. *Education and the Realistic Outlook*, by Frederick S. Breed

Professor Breed represents the neorealistic approach to education. Neorealism is sponsored by such philosophers as Ralph Barton Perry and Bertrand Russell. It has much in common with modern critical realism, though it differs from it in its interpretation of a significant factor in the theory of knowledge.

Professor Breed joined the faculty of the University of Chicago in 1917. His earlier contributions were in the fields of psychology, educational measurements, classroom management, spelling, and arithmetic. In 1939 he published *Education and the New Realism*.

Neorealism is not a systematic type of philosophy. It does not, like idealism or even pragmatism, attempt to deal ambitiously with all problems confronting the twentieth century man. It has not as yet built up philosophic systems, like those of Kant, Hegel, or Dewey. It is rather a critical, reactionary mood. It began by criticizing idealism and later pragmatism. Its history goes back to the Scotch common-sense school (represented by leading English thinkers at the end of the eighteenth century and quite popular in our country at that time), and was opposed to the higher speculations of rationalism and empiricism. But though neorealism is largely a revival of the common-sense tradition, some of its leading ideas spring from modern sources.

The doctrines of neorealism are briefly these:

1. There is in the process of knowing some external reality which is independent of the knower and different from the knower. It is not dependent for existence on a knowing factor, as sensation. Objects may move about in the knowing subject without becoming changed. Objects include also concepts. Also these are independent. They exist even when the knower does not think of

them (note the difference between this view and Kant's projection of categories).

2. This knowing relation is a unique relation. It differs from pragmatism, which defines knowing in terms of activity and adjustment. It differs also from idealism, which defines knowing as involving also willing and feeling and which joins logic and ethics.

It is this approach to the theory of knowledge which Professor Breed presents at length in his *Education and the New Realism* (Macmillan, 1939) and which is the basis of his philosophy of education published in the *Yearbook*.

To discuss the details of Professor Breed's point of view would mean going far beyond the scope of this essay. We can do no more than present the heart of his philosophy and its chief implications.

In an introductory chapter Professor Breed stresses the need of educational preparedness and of interest in fundamentals. He hurls this accusation at the educational world:

We have been challenged and have been found wanting. We have been found wanting not only in material defense; we have been found wanting in mental defense as well. As a people we have had neither the arguments nor the armaments to repel totalitarian attack (p. 88).

In the first major part of his essay he discusses the temper of the realistic mind under the heads: definition of philosophy, impressive revival of realism, basic principle of realism. He regards "philosophy as continuous with science, not separate therefrom. As here defined, the subject has neither materials nor methods peculiar to itself, but employs the materials and the methods of science. It differs from science . . . in the degree of generality of its problems" (p. 91). In passing, it should be said that the neorealist's and the experimentalist's interpretation of the relation of philosophy to science constitutes a crucial point of difference between both philosophies.

The basic principle of neorealism is, according to Professor Breed, *the principle of independence*. "A realist does not believe that the process of knowledge is constitutive of its objects. Whereas instrumentalism ("instrumentalism" is Dewey's version of pragmatism) believes that objects are *created* by acts of cognition, the realist believes that they are *disclosed* by such acts" (p. 93). One finds it difficult at first to appreciate of what immediate significance *the principle of independence* is for the educative process. Even Professor Breed admits, "Since no one has as yet worked out the educational implications of modern realism in any fullness, much will remain to be done after the present chapter is com-

pleted" (p. 94). But as one reads on—the presentation is very critical and controversial—one begins to realize that Professor Breed is subtly attacking experimentalism at its roots. Neorealism posits the independent reality of a thing. This means when applied to the educative process that a thing has meaning not only when the experimentalist *creates* it by means of the interaction of the organism with the environment, but that it is meaningful *per se*, being both pre-existent and post-existent. There is, therefore, the possibility at least that truth exists. There may be such a thing as a reasonably stable curriculum even though the experimentalist, who is possessed by the idea of the "novelly emerging," may deny it. And thus one gains the impression that ultimately Professor Breed is holding out for subject matter, truth, and authority, even though he clings to the methods and the established data of scientific experimentation.

In support of this interpretation of Professor Breed's philosophy of education—if we are wrong, we trust readers will correct us—we are adducing a number of significant statements which occur in the remaining chapters of his essay. These chapters are titled: "Knowledge and the Educative Process"; "Realism *versus* Instrumentalism"; "In Defense of Realism"; "The Notion of Truth"; "The Bipolar Theory of Education"; "Foundation of Educational Measurement"; and, "The School and the Social Order." Referring to the "progressives," Professor Breed writes:

They become so absorbed in the process (*viz.*, the process rather than the product of the knowledge quest) that in unrestrained and irresponsible moments some of them pooh-pooh the truths of subjects as of small consequence in a program of instruction (p. 95).

In a paragraph in which he posits the question "What value in conservatism?" he replies:

To the writer there is no progress without conservatism. . . . Conservatism . . . means a healthy respect for the human values realized to date. It maintains that these values represent our most precious social inheritance. . . . The conservative believes that educational prosperity is like business prosperity; it demands attention to profits as well as to processes of production (pp. 96, 97).

In his chapter on "Realism *versus* Instrumentalism," he takes the instrumentalists to task as follows:

Instrumentalism is solipsistic in character, suffering from the rigors of a radical and parsimonious methodology, flouting the intuitions of common sense regarding the existence of an external world, and attributing creative power to the intelligence of man to supply data of knowledge that an amputated cosmos can no longer supply (p. 101).

This philosophy (instrumentalism) is to inspire its devotees with quixotic schemes of educational, political, and economic

reform. The world that man has made, he can quite easily unmake, they tend to believe, as if man were the measure of all things. . . . The more radical exponents of this philosophy . . . have been accountable for most of the romantic adventures in "creative education," they have been responsible for encouraging the heresy that truth is a fetish of conservatives designed to keep a long-suffering world in its accustomed groove, they have been responsible for shaking the confidence of teachers and pupils in the fundamentals of the democratic way of life, and for holding up the Russian model as a pattern for a more beautiful society (p. 101).

Professor Breed holds to the pragmatic method, but with important reservations. He writes:

The realist is generally regarded as a somewhat more conservative individual (in comparison with the instrumentalist) and probably is. He is somewhat more conservative because he has more respect than the instrumentalist for the truths of science. . . . To him an idea or a plan of action achieves the stamp of truth . . . by conformity with something external to itself and not of its own creation. . . . The laws of the physical world thus become more than mere assertions regarding the qualities and interrelations of thought creations. They are statements, including mathematical formulas, reflecting the nature and interrelations of independent existents—a vast concourse of entities with which our personal entities must live and about which they must know if they would live effectively (p. 101).

In his chapter—the most significant in the essay—titled "In Defense of Realism," Professor Breed says:

Realism in its totality is an hypothesis. So is instrumentalism. The realist is a fellow close to common sense and to the common man in his attitude toward knowledge (p. 105).

In the same chapter he quotes approvingly of R. B. Perry's castigation of Dewey's emphasis on activity, to wit:

For Dewey, activity is an ineffable ultimate assumed as the mysterious source from which all objects and ideas somehow blossom forth (p. 106).

Professor Breed continues:

The realist, in the presence of a problem, is just as much interested as the instrumentalist in the question, "What in the name of Heaven shall I do?" but he is also tremendously interested in the question, "What in the name of Heaven is that?" His interest in the second question, true, is often, though not always, subsidiary to his interest in the first. The instrumentalist seldom stresses the query "What is that?" as the central theme of inquiry, after the manner of William James, for he believes "that" which problematically confronts him is not yet what comes to be known. His language is reminiscent of Gertrude Stein and the cult of the unintelligible, for he seems to say: If anything is anything, it is something that it is not yet (p. 107).

For Professor Breed, knowledge has at least relative stability. He writes:

Most instrumentalists are irked by a man like President Hutchins, who stresses the relatively permanent elements of experience and the importance of acquiring knowledge of such elements. The Newtonian law of gravitation remained unmodified for two centuries, and even after Einstein attached an amendment, the old law remains valid for all general purposes (p. 108).

As to the place of subject matter in the curriculum, Professor Breed says:

The traditional subject curriculum is overgrown with moss, but subject matter, the fundamental truth that has accrued from the historic stream of human experience, remains among the transcendent aims of education, to be achieved indirectly, yes, and directly as well, but in any case to be achieved (p. 122).

Perhaps the most devastating criticism of Dewey's doctrine of relativity that ever came to our attention we found in Professor Breed's caustic remark:

The menace of authoritarianism does not inhere in a progressive but always tentative systematization of knowledge, any more than it inheres in the apparent changelessness of Dewey's philosophy of chance, or the relativity of all doctrines but his doctrine of relativity, or the persistence without shadow of turning of his radical-empirical principle, or the perdurability of his operational criterion of truth. If these are not dogmas, one gets no hint of it from his undeviating adherence to them for over a generation (p. 123).

In summarizing Professor Breed's outlook, we would say:

1. Neorealism inclines to a conservative point of view, though it has its source and basis in the methods and findings of scientific inquiry.

2. It argues with conservatism for the application in education to the *discovery* of pre-existent facts as against the *creativity* concept of the instrumentalists.

3. It objects to an overemphasis on activity and method at the expense of subject matter and content.

4. It is materialistic, inasmuch as it believes that the psychical and the physical belong to the same *continuum*.

5. It stresses direct, not only indirect interest.

6. It believes that the educator must strive to build up in the child a balance between freedom and authority, but does not show how this can be done.

7. It believes with Aristotle that human nature is the same essentially for all men, and that individual differences are accidental and should not be overstressed.

8. It holds that the child is superior to the State (opposed to the doctrine of Aristotle and the totalitarian powers).

C. *An Idealistic Philosophy of Education*, by Herman H. Horne

Professor Horne is professor of history of education and history of philosophy at New York University. He is regarded a Christian idealist. "In his philosophy God is the prime center of

reference, Jesus Christ is the symbol of the kind of life a pious man may strive after and the assurance of God's benevolent attitude toward man" (Norman Woelfel, *Molders of the American Mind*, p. 51). He has written such books as *Jesus, Our Standard* (1918); *Modern Problems as Jesus Saw Them* (1918); *Jesus—the Master Teacher* (1920); *Jesus as a Philosopher* (1927). According to Wahlquist (*op. cit.*, p. 386), Professor Horne is known best in educational circles for his exposition and idealistic commentary on Dewey's *Democracy and Education*, known as *The Democratic Philosophy of Education* (1932).

Except for his strong religious interest and for the inclusion in his philosophy of much that modern science of education has to offer, Professor Horne represents perhaps the most forceful present-day leader of the type of idealism which, under the leadership of Hegel, began its triumphant march some hundred years ago and which even the powerful assaults of naturalistic science on all forms of idealism have not been able to check. The reason is that idealism, or at least types of it, is so firmly rooted in human experience that though crushed to the ground, it always rises again. As Professor Wahlquist (*op. cit.*, p. 46) puts it:

Historically, idealism is the oldest of the three viewpoints (idealism, realism, and pragmatism). Traditionally, it is the strongest; most of us were born and reared under its influence. The state, the church, and the family are highly idealistic. Try as we will to escape, most of us remain idealists all of our lives. Even the most cold-blooded scientist and the most hard-headed pragmatist have moments when they walk by faith in a system not established in scientific laboratories or completely verified by human experience.

Professor Horne's essay consists of two parts. In part one he enlarges on idealism as a philosophy of education. "Idealism," as defined by Professor Horne, "is the conclusion that the universe is an expression of intelligence and will, that the enduring substance of the world is of the nature of mind, that the material is explained by the mental" (p. 139).

Professor Horne develops this definition at some length and submits ten reasons for accepting idealism. Though much of this material seems quite irrelevant to his philosophy of education, it does suggest the underpinning of his educational views.

In the second part of his essay Professor Horne discusses the learner and his learning; the curriculum; methods of teaching; school and society; and objectives of living and learning. In his account of "the learner," Professor Horne believes that the teacher should recognize the *personality* of the pupil and cultivate that personality. He argues that from the naturalistic viewpoint "the pupil is not only a grouping of atoms, but his reactions to the

actions of his environment are mechanical. He is really a machine" (p. 152); from the realistic point of view "the pupil is just a nervous system in a physical body responding selectively to the stimuli of his environment" (p. 152); from the pragmatic point of view the pupil is an "organism endowed with the capacity for an undetermined and original response to a specific situation" (p. 153). "Pragmatism," so Professor Horne tells us, "has the advantage over naturalism and realism of recognizing the unpredictable factors in the behavior of the pupil, which makes of him an *individual* who counts for something" (p. 153). But idealism has a higher appreciation of the pupil. Pupils are not machines, they are not a series of mechanical reactions to selected stimuli, and they are not mere individuals (even lower animals and inanimate objects possess individuality), but pupils are "*persons*, with the capacity to formulate, feel, and follow ideals of conduct" (p. 153). Because the pupil is a person, he can be taught, cultivated, and be trained to follow the path that leads to perfection even though he may not reach the final goal.

"The curriculum," so Professor Horne believes, "has strategic import" (p. 150). "It should undertake to give a rounded view of man in his world, a taste for the best things in life, and the ability to take one's own practical part in the world" (p. 160). It should be "ideal-centered," rather than "child-centered" or "society-centered" (versus "progressivism" and experimentalism). The curriculum must include, in keeping with the nature of man as a being who thinks, feels, and wills, the sciences (physics, chemistry, biology, geography, mathematics, astronomy, psychology, and sociology); it must include also the fine arts (drawing, painting, sculpture, architecture, the various forms of poetic and prose literature, and the rhythmic temporal art of music); and it must include the practical arts (*e.g.*: agriculture, the industrial arts, the political arts, such as the making of war and the concluding of peace treaties).

Professor Horne presents a good overview of methods. But he concludes: "We overdo methodology. Adapt yourself to the situation, use well the method you adopt, get your subject liked, get yourself liked. It is not enough to know method. We must know our pupils and our subjects, and we must be likable people" (p. 172).

As to objectives of education, Professor Horne inclines to those advocated by the Educational Policies Commission, to wit: self-realization, human relationships, economic efficiency, and civic responsibility. But he adds: "There is no objection to this statement if we include enough under 'self-realization,' especially health, art, science, philosophy, and religion" (p. 191). Of interest, though

of doubtful value because of its obvious over-simplifications, is Professor Horne's comparison of naturalism, pragmatism, and idealism by means of symbols intended to express fundamental aspects of these philosophies of education. We regret that he did not include neorealism:

<i>Naturalism</i>	<i>Pragmatism</i>	<i>Idealism</i>
naturu-centric	anthropo-centric	theo-centric
body	mind	soul
senses	creativity and growth	spirituality
the actual	the practical	the ideal
might	using intelligence	using right
survival	acting socially	making sacrifices
organism	individuality	personality

We briefly summarize Professor Horne's views:

1. Idealism is traditional in its outlook.
2. It recognizes absolute principles though it holds that only the mind can discover them.
3. It believes in a moral world order which sees to it that everyone receives his reward in time or in eternity.
4. It believes that true reality is mind, ideas, purposes, personality. It rejects all forms of materialism which reduce ideas and purposes to some form of physical existence.
5. It holds that schools should aid in improving society.
6. It believes with experimentalism and realism that the child is superior to the State.

D. *In Defense of the Philosophy of Education*, by Mortimer J. Adler

Prof. Mortimer J. Adler is associate professor of the philosophy of law at the University of Chicago. Among his chief publications are: *Crime, Law and Social Science* (1932); *The Nature of Traditional Proof* (1933); *What Man Has Made of Man* (1937); *St. Thomas and the Gentiles* (1938); *Problems for Thomists* (1940). He has also contributed notable articles to various periodicals. Some of them appeared in *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophy Association*.

Professor Adler is frequently referred to as an Aristotelian. One reason is that he shares with Aristotle some of the Stagyrte's basic assumptions. Another reason is that his style is strikingly reminiscent of Aristotle's manner of presentation. He occasionally employs the technique of syllogistic reasoning, which the reader unschooled in deductive logic finds difficult to follow. Professor Adler believes with Aristotle that it is possible to build up a system of first principles, a system of metaphysics, to which every rational creature must subscribe. But Professor Adler also shows affinities with scholastic thought, though Professor McGucken, S. J., is led to say of him and President Hutchins:

With the metaphysical principles of which President Hutchins speaks — which Professor Adler has clearly enunciated — the

Catholic will readily concur. His only difficulty is that they do not go far enough (p. 256).

In order to appreciate the full implications of Professor Adler's essay in the *Yearbook*, one does well to consider Professor Adler's views of philosophy, theology, and science, which he eloquently expressed at the *Conference of Science, Philosophy and Religion* in New York City in September, 1940, and which I take the privilege to submit:

With respect to philosophy, Professor Adler claims, "the following propositions must be affirmed. He who denies any one of them denies philosophy":

1. Philosophy is public knowledge, not private opinion, in the same sense that science is knowledge, not opinion.

2. Philosophical knowledge answers questions which science cannot answer, now or ever, because its method is not adapted to answering such questions.

3. Because their methods are thus distinct, each being adapted to a different object or inquiry, philosophical and scientific knowledge are logically independent of one another, which means that the truth and falsity of philosophical principles or conclusions do not depend upon the changing content of scientific knowledge.

4. Philosophy is superior to science, both theoretically and practically; theoretically, because it is knowledge of the being of things, whereas science studies only their phenomenal manifestations; practically, because philosophy establishes moral conclusions, whereas scientific knowledge yields only technological applications; this last point means that science can give us only a control over operable means, but it cannot make a single judgment about good and bad, right and wrong, in terms of the ends of human life.

5. There can be no conflict between scientific and philosophic truths, although philosophers may correct the errors of scientists who try to answer questions beyond their professional competence, just as scientists can correct the errors of philosophers guilty of a similar transgression.

6. There are no systems of philosophy, each of which may be considered true in its own way by criteria of internal consistency, each differing from the others, as so many systems of geometry, in terms of different origins in diverse, but equally arbitrary, postulates or definitions.

7. The first principles of all philosophical knowledge are metaphysical, and metaphysics is valid knowledge of both sensible and supra-sensible being.

8. Metaphysics is able to demonstrate the existence of supra-sensible being, for it can demonstrate the existence of God by appealing to the evidence of the senses and the principles of reason, and without any reliance upon articles of religious faith.

With respect to religion, theology, and faith, Professor Adler laid down the following theses:

1. Religion involves knowledge of God and of man's destiny, knowledge which is not naturally acquired in the sense in which both science and philosophy are natural knowledge.

2. Religious faith, on which sacred theology rests, is itself a supernatural act of the human intellect and is thus a Divine gift.

3. Because God is its cause, faith is more certain than knowledge resulting from the purely natural action of the human faculties.

4. What is known by faith about God's nature and man's destiny is knowledge which exceeds the power of the human intellect to attain without God's revelation of Himself and His providence.

5. Sacred theology is independent of philosophy, in that its principles are truths of reason, but this does not mean that theology can be speculatively developed without reason serving faith.

6. There can be no conflict between philosophical and theological truths, although theologians may correct the errors of philosophers who try to answer questions beyond the competence of natural reason, just as philosophers can correct the errors of theologians who violate the autonomy of reason.

7. Sacred theology is superior to philosophy both theoretically and practically; theoretically, because it is more perfect knowledge of God and His creatures; practically, because moral philosophy is insufficient to direct man to God as his last end.

8. Just as there are no systems of philosophy, but only philosophical knowledge less or more adequately possessed by different men, so there is only one true religion, less or more adequately embodied in the existing diversity of creeds.

As the title of Professor Adler's contribution to the *Yearbook* suggests, he is not attempting an exposition of a philosophy of education. He is rather offering a defense of *the* philosophy of education. The question whether there can be a philosophy of education, Professor Adler answers in the affirmative. The question whether there can be a variety of philosophies of education, he answers in the negative. He believes there can be only *one* philosophy of education, that is to say, every philosophy of education must rest on a set of absolute and universal principles, one and the same set. "There is only *one* true philosophy of education, only *one* body of philosophical knowledge about education, and not a variety of equally entertainable 'systems,' each with its own arbitrary 'postulates' and 'definitions'" (p. 199).

Professor Adler begins his discussion by demonstrating on rational grounds that not only the science, but also the philosophy of education rests on solid ground. It rests not on opinion, but on knowledge. Since the philosophy of education rests on knowledge, not on opinion, there can only be *one* set of true principles and conclusions. These principles, of course, are true only in the light of experienced fact and in terms of the canons of rational

procedure. Professor Adler makes it clear, however, that the principles of religious education rest on other grounds, namely, on religious faith.

The difficulty of presenting a philosophy of education lies, so Professor Adler believes, in the consideration that the philosophy of education like the philosophy of law or the philosophy of art does not deal with a clearly defined set of problems, as does, for example, the philosophy of ethics or the philosophy of aesthetics. A further difficulty is that the philosophy of education deals with a set of problems "which require us to cross the boundaries of such objectively constituted subject matters as ethics, politics, of metaphysics, and psychology" (p. 203). It therefore becomes necessary for the philosopher of education to state at the outset which problems in education he means to include in his treatment. Again, this set of problems can, according to Professor Adler, be solved only in the light of prior philosophical knowledge. Such knowledge the educator must possess in addition to his technical competence or practical experience in the work of education.

What is the nature of the problems which the philosopher of education must solve? They are practical rather than theoretical, that is to say, they are concerned with questions what *should* be done, about what men *should* do in any realm of action or productions (p. 206). They differ from theoretical questions, for these describe and explain facts. They differ also from the problems with which the science of education has to do. The science of education has to do with theoretical problems inasmuch as it is *descriptive*, or *explanatory*, and not *normative* (p. 207).

In agreement with Professor Adler's view of the nature of problems with which the philosophy of education deals, is his definition of education. "Education is the process by which those powers (abilities, capacities) of men that are susceptible to habituation are perfected by *good* habits, through *means artistically contrived*, and employed by one man to help another or himself achieve the *end* in view (i. e., good habits)" (p. 209). This definition of education implies, according to Professor Adler, that the problems of education are concerned with the good, for education aims to form not any sort of habits, but only good habits, traditionally analyzed as the virtues. They are furthermore *artistic* problems, problems of how to use means for producing certain desirable effects as ends. They are also *ethical* problems in so far as they require us to consider the virtues and to understand their role as means in achieving the ultimate end of life, happiness. They are, finally, *political* problems in so far as they require us to consider the responsibility, not simply of one man to another,

but of the community to its members, with regard to helping them become educated (pp. 209, 210).

It is clear therefore, from Professor Adler's point of view, that the philosophy of education deals with problems that are *normative*. But if they are normative, then it is obvious that the philosophy of education includes questions about the ultimate ends of the process of education and about the means in general. In fact, the study of ends and means are the basic considerations of the philosophy of education.

But the philosophy of education also conceives education as a co-operative enterprise. "The arts of learning and teaching merely assist in the cultivation of a mind by co-operating with its natural processes of knowing, just as agricultural techniques assist nature in the production of vegetables" (p. 211). Professor Adler believes that education is almost exclusively and most always education-by-another, that is, a co-operative affair. This the philosophy of education must recognize.

Professor Adler devotes some space to what he believes are the major divisions of the educational process. These are:

1. Self-education and education-by-another;
2. Types of habit established by education — these are basically intellectual and moral habits;
3. Individual differences in relation to education. We note here his statement: "Brutes can be trained or conditioned, but they cannot be educated, for education, whether by one's self or by another, is always a work of reason, and brutes are irrational" (p. 215).
4. Institutional or non-institutional education.

The scope, then, of the philosophy of education is:

1. The ends of education must be conceived in such a way that they hold equally for self-education and education-by-another;
2. The philosophy of education is concerned neither principally nor exclusively with the work of the elementary or even the secondary schools; it is concerned with all levels and with all forms of education;
3. The philosopher of education must consider the education of youth as merely preparatory to adult education and all education-by-another, whether or not institutional, as preparatory to self-education. In other words the philosopher of education must always take into consideration that the educated adult is the end of the educational process, and that all institutionalized education is only a means to that end.
4. Educational institutions cannot be primarily responsible for moral education. Institutionally, the primary responsibility for moral education lies in the home and the Church and in the law-making and law-enforcing functions of the political community.
5. An educational philosophy can be *adequate practically* only if it is subalternated to moral theology [sic].

Professor Adler is persuaded that there are absolute ends and means in education which the philosopher of education must take into account. "The *ultimate* ends of education are the same for all men at all times and everywhere. They are absolute and universal principles" (p. 221). "Similarly, it must be said that educational means *in general* are the same for all men at all times everywhere. If the *ultimate* ends of education are its first principles, the means *in general* are its secondary principles" (p. 222). "The scope of the philosophy of education goes no further than this — to know these first and secondary principles in an absolute and universal manner" (p. 222).

Professor Adler distinguishes between "policies" which govern a class of cases and "practices" which govern a single case. Such "policies" and "practices" however, since they lie in the sphere of opinion, do not concern the philosophy of education. The philosophy of education deals only with *universal* principles (principles which govern *every* case in point), for these lie in the sphere of knowledge. Reduced to practice, this means: The philosopher of education formulates the principles of education, but he determines no policies and makes no decisions (p. 228). "The philosopher of education is primarily concerned with the educational *ideal*, with answering the question What is the best education *absolutely*, that is, for any man according to his essence?" (p. 229).

To the question whether the problems of educational philosophy are ethical or political, Professor Adler replies: "Since the ends are the first principles and the means are secondary principles, the problems of educational philosophy are primarily ethical (promotion of the good of the individual) and only secondarily political" (promotion of the good of the State) (p. 231).

But now comes the important question: How does the educational philosopher solve the problems which lie in the sphere of philosophic inquiry? The answer to this question constitutes the second part of Professor Adler's essay.

To begin with, Professor Adler cautions the educator not to confuse policies and principles. Much disagreement in educational practice arises from such confusions. The educational philosopher can resolve conflicts in policy. He can do so in two ways, either (1) by demonstrating that one line of policy necessarily follows from the true principles, whereas another is incompatible with the true principles rightly understood; or (2) where two or several policies are seen to be compatible with the true principles, he may be able to show that one is probably better than the rest as a particularization of the principles for this type of situation (p. 235). In the former solution he would answer the

question "What is the best education absolutely?" in the second the question "What is the best education relative to this or that type of situation?"

In the last section of the second part of the essay Professor Adler lays down basic considerations which the educational philosopher must take into account when he attempts to solve a problem in the light of philosophic principles. He develops, for lack of space, only the first. But we shall enumerate all of them. They are:

1. A demonstration that the first principles of education (the ends) are absolute and universal;
2. A demonstrative analysis of these ends in detail, their number, their order, and relation to one another;
3. A demonstration that the secondary principles of education (the means in general) are absolute and universal;
4. A demonstrative analysis of these means in detail, their number, their order, and relation to one another;
5. A demonstrative analysis of the relation between the means in general and their ends;
6. A demonstrative critique of educational policies so far as these, in whole or in part, are incompatible with the true principles rightly understood; and
7. A less than demonstrative analysis of the variety of educational policies which particularize the principles for different possible types of contingent situations, attempting to say which sort of policy is probably best relative to a given set of possible contingencies (p. 235).

In developing the first of these considerations, Professor Adler does not expound the actual demonstration; he merely shows what is involved in such a demonstration. He does this largely in terms of syllogistic argumentation.

Summarizing the basic thoughts of Professor Adler's essay, we venture the following:

1. He believes with Aristotle that reason is the distinctive characteristic of man and is the same for all men;
2. He believes in absolute principles and thus opposes Professor Dewey, the experimentalists, and the "progressives";
3. He leaves it to the practitioner in education and the scientist in education to solve problems which are descriptive, for he holds that educational philosophy is basically normative;
4. He believes that the field of philosophic inquiry in education is restricted to principles and that it is not concerned with policies and practices;
5. "He recognizes that to the extent which metaphysics may reveal the existence of God and man's dependence on Him, a purely natural or intellectual education is disclosed as inadequate for achieving perfection of man" (criticism by Professor Brubacher, p. 299).

E. *The Philosophy of Catholic Education*, by William McGucken, S. J.

Professor McGucken is professor of education at St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo. His chief books are: *The Jesuits and Education* (1932) and *The Catholic Way in Education* (1934). He has also contributed articles to educational journals.

Professor McGucken's presentation lacks the charm of Professor Kilpatrick's style, the flash and flare of Professor Breed's argumentation, the calm and reflective mood of Professor Horne, the persuasiveness of Professor Adler's dialectics, but it makes up for these deficiencies, if deficiencies they be, by the weight of its implications.

Following a brief introduction in which Professor McGucken tells us that "to understand the philosophy of Catholic education, it is necessary to understand . . . the Catholic philosophy of life" (p. 251), that "the essentials of Christian philosophy are found in the New Testament and the early writings of the Fathers of the Church" (p. 251), and that "through all the centuries from Augustine to Aquinas and Suarez and Bellarmine to Newman and Chesterton and Pius XII there is seen a uniform pattern of the Christian philosophy of life" (p. 251), he discusses the Catholic philosophy of education under the following major heads: 1. Philosophic Bases of Catholic Position; 2. Theological Bases of the Catholic Theory of Education; 3. Objectives of Catholic Education; 4. Nature of Knowledge; and 5. Nature of Society. In his conclusion he summarizes the essentials in the philosophy of Catholic education.

In the chapter "Philosophic Bases of Catholic Position" Professor McGucken speaks in defense of the ability of human reason to ascertain truths about God and man and in defense of metaphysics. Reason tells man that there is a God. This truth that there is a God, Professor McGucken regards a cornerstone of scholasticism. He says, "Scholastic philosophy is theocentric. Catholic life and thought and education have God as their basis" (p. 252). This God is "not the undying energy of the physicist, not the vague impersonal being of the Deist, but He is a personal God, who has created man, upon whom man is dependent, and to whom, therefore, man has certain duties and obligations" (p. 252). There are, so he maintains, rational proofs for the existence of God, one of which is the argument from contingency. "This fact of facts, the existence of a personal God, is of supreme importance for any program of education. . . . In the area of character education . . . the Catholic would hold that any character-training program that left God out of consideration would be not merely inadequate but utterly false" (p. 253).

Reason, so Professor McGucken continues, also tells us some-

thing about man. Scholastic philosophy, arguing from reason, holds:

1. That man was created by God, created for a purpose. That purpose is man's happiness, a happiness to be realized only perfectly in God;

2. That man is composed of body and soul, united in essential unity. Therefore it is not the mind that thinks (idealism), not the body that feels (materialism), it is the person, John Smith, that thinks and feels;

3. That the soul is immaterial, spiritual, that is, intrinsically independent of matter, although necessarily united to the body to form a composite;

4. That man has an intellect; he is capable of understanding, of forming judgments, of drawing conclusions;

5. That man has free will. . . . Free will does not imply that we act without a motive. Nor does it imply that all human acts are free.

6. Because of his intellect and free will man is essentially different from the highest form of brute life. Man is an animal, but a rational animal.

7. Since the soul of man is immaterial or spiritual, it can be destroyed by God alone;

8. Some human acts are of their very nature good and deserving of praise; other human acts are of their very nature, that is, intrinsically, bad and deserving of blame. The scholastic holds that there is a norm to determine the good act from the bad act.

This norm is man's rational nature taken in its entirety. Reason teaches that man's nature is composite, made up of the body and soul; that it is social by its very essence; that it is contingent, not responsible for its own being and existence, but dependent on its Creator, God. Therefore man has duties to himself, to his neighbor, to his God.

In view of the light that reason throws on man's existence, it is possible to formulate a rational definition of education. Professor McGucken approves of the following:

Education is the organized development and equipment of all the powers of a human being, moral, intellectual, and physical, by and for their individual social uses, directed towards the union of these activities with their Creator as their final end (p. 255).

Yet reason cannot tell us all about God and man. This reflection leads Professor McGucken to devote a chapter to "theological bases of the Catholic theory of education." In this chapter he develops chiefly the Catholic doctrine of the supernatural and its implications. Man has a supernatural. God added this to man's body and soul at creation. Adam lost this supernatural when he fell into sin. His descendants also lost it. This loss Professor McGucken defines as "deprivation." This super-

nature was restored to man by the atoning work of Jesus Christ. Both Calvin and Rousseau are wrong: Calvin because he believed in the total depravity of man, Rousseau because he believed in the total goodness of man. Only the Catholic Church has the true teaching regarding the fall of man with its doctrine of "deprivation."

In the next chapter Professor McGucken enlarges on the objectives of Catholic education. Though there are specific objectives for the various levels of Catholic education, everything taught within all schools of Catholics must be taught in the frame of reference to the supernatural. From the *Encyclical on Christian Education* issued by Pius XI he quotes a number of passages, only three of which I am reproducing here in whole or in part:

The proper and immediate end of Christian education is to co-operate with divine grace in forming the true and perfect Christian, that is, to form Christ Himself in those regenerated by Baptism. . . .

Hence the true Christian, product of Christian education, is the supernatural man who thinks, judges, and acts constantly and consistently in accordance with right reason illumined by the supernatural light of the example and teaching of Christ; in other words, to use the current term, the true and finished man of character

The true Christian does not renounce the activities of this life, he does not stunt his natural faculties; but he develops and perfects them, by co-ordinating them with the supernatural. . . .

We pass over most of the content of the chapter in which Professor McGucken discusses the "nature of knowledge"—it is the Aristotelian-Aquinas theory—and merely call attention to some implications of his theory of a liberal education. Also a liberal education must have a religious outlook. "If religion is banned from a liberal education, you have merely an incomplete education, you have a maimed and distorted education" (p. 280). What are the elements of a liberal education? How are they to be integrated? Professor McGucken replies:

Classical culture, Christian culture, the medieval synthesis of Thomas Aquinas, and modern science and modern thought—these are the strands that the Catholic believes must be combined somehow into unity to provide a liberal education for the youth of our day. . . . The answer to the problem of integration is one word, a monosyllable, Christ. Christianity is Christ (pp. 280, 281).

In the final chapter, titled "Nature of Society," Professor McGucken shows that on the purely natural level there are two societies of educational import—the State and the family. Of these two, the family has priority over the State (scholasticism disagrees with Aristotle on this point). But there is, in the supernatural order, a third society concerned with education, the Church. "Since education, in the Catholic view, has a necessary connection

with man's supernatural destiny, the Catholic Church rightly claims that the education of her children belongs to her pre-eminently" (p. 282).

In his concluding paragraphs Professor McGucken calls attention to some essentials in the philosophy of Catholic education. They are the Catholic doctrines regarding the nature and supernatural destiny of man; the nature of truth ("truth exists . . . reason is capable of reaching with complete certainty the most sublime truths of the natural order . . . for the truths of the supernatural order revelation is needed," p. 285); and agencies of education ("since man has a supernatural destiny, any educational system that fails to impart religious instruction is not acceptable to the Catholics," p. 285). Accidentals in the philosophy of Catholic education are, according to Professor McGucken, the curriculum ("the one thing the Catholic will insist on is that, whatever type the curriculum may be, the first place must be assigned to religion," p. 286); method ("the Catholic as a Catholic is not concerned with method. . . . Method must have as its aim the teaching of the child to think for himself, to express adequately his own thoughts, and to appreciate in a human way the true, the beautiful, and the good" p. 286); freedom versus discipline ("The Catholic school . . . believes in discipline, but that discipline must eventually be self-discipline. . . . Discipline is necessary. Discipline means right order," p. 286).

In summarizing Professor McGucken's educational views, we note in particular the following:

1. Catholic education makes reason an important source of knowledge and an arbiter of truth;
2. Education must be God-centered. There can be no genuine morality without a knowledge and fear of God;
3. Knowledge exists. It is based on reason and on revelation;
4. There are absolute truths;
5. Man is a rational being;
6. Man has a supernature; this is an addition to his nature of body and soul and implies a supernatural life of grace with a supernatural destiny of union with God;
7. Original sin means the deprivation of this supernature.
8. Catholic education aims to restore this supernature.
9. The child is superior to the State.
10. The Church is responsible for the religious education of its constituency.
11. "The objective of the Church is to realize the consequences of a child's incorporation with Christ through baptism, a . . . realization that Christ and the Church of which he is a member are one thing — the Mystical Body of Christ" (p. 283).

We have now concluded our analyses of the five current philosophies of education represented in the *Yearbook*. There

remains the task, however, of establishing relationships between them, that is, of pointing out agreements and differences. In the final essay of the *Yearbook* Professor Brubacher offers such a critical and comparative analysis. Lack of space forbids us to repeat what Professor Brubacher has most successfully done. We shall merely call attention to two cardinal differences between these philosophies. The one relates to a definition of terms, the other to the attitude of these philosophies of education to divine revelation.

As Professor Adler has pointed out, a philosopher of education ought clearly define the scope of his operations in the field of education. Professor Adler defined this scope for himself. We have noted that for him it is vastly different from the areas in which the practitioner in education operates. It will be remembered, too, that the other philosophies of education represented in the *Yearbook*, particularly experimentalism, idealism, and scholasticism, do not proceed as Professor Adler does. In these philosophies of education considerable space is devoted to matters which lie squarely within the field of educational practice. The question therefore arises: What is the job that a philosophy of education is expected to do? In other words: Is Professor Adler's point of view well taken, or is it legitimate also to regard the analyses of Professors Kilpatrick, Horne, Breed, and McGucken as philosophies of education? In our humble opinion, Professor Adler's point is not only well taken, but also absolutely compelling unless the word *philosophy* is divested of the peculiar meaning which originally attached to it and is but another synonym for "synthesis," or "overview," or "Weltanschauung," or scientific description of a body of materials more or less related.

With respect to the attitude of the five philosophies of education presented in the *Yearbook* to divine revelation, we note sharp points of difference. Experimentalism, to begin with, takes a negative, if not hostile, attitude to revelation. Its pragmatic outlook does not allow for transcendental truths. Realism shares with experimentalism this attitude toward the Bible. Idealism manifests a high regard for Scripture, though it is not apparent from the *Yearbook* whether or not Professor Horne subscribes to the fundamental teaching of the Bible, salvation by grace alone through faith in Christ. Professor Adler specifically states that he is presenting a natural or secular philosophy of education. "However," as Professor Brubacher correctly observes, "he recognizes that to the extent to which metaphysics may reveal the existence of God and man's dependence on Him, a purely natural or intellectual education is disclosed as inadequate for achieving the perfection of man. For this purpose he admits another kind of knowledge

is 'possible,' that of faith and revelation" (p. 299). But even if Professor Adler had made faith in divine revelation a cornerstone in his philosophy of education, the question would still be whether he accepts the basic teaching of the Bible that man is saved by grace alone through faith in Christ. Catholicism regards the Bible as a source of knowledge and of greater authority than the postulates of reason and stresses the intimate relationship that exists between the believer and Christ. Professor McGucken, as was pointed out before, even asserts that "the Catholic believes humbly and sincerely that the answer to the problem of integration is one word, a monosyllable, Christ. Christianity is Christ" (pp. 280 and 281). Yet nowhere does Professor McGucken clearly indicate that Jesus is the Way, the Truth, and the Life (John 14:6) in the sense that only faith in Him, without the deeds of the Law, insures eternal bliss.

We ought now, after this brief comparison of the philosophies of education presented in the *Yearbook*, proceed to suggest basic considerations of a Lutheran philosophy of education. But before doing so, we believe it important to relate the philosophies presented in the *Yearbook* to the historical and educational background which they reflect. Both this background and the fundamental viewpoints of a Lutheran philosophy of education will be discussed in a second article, to be published in the next issue of this journal.

St. Louis, Mo.

PAUL BRETSCHER

Homemade Homiletics

Paper Read at a Pastors' Institute

Homiletics is that branch of theology which treats of homilies, or the making of sermons. And when I have chosen as my theme "Homemade Homiletics," it means just that. They are sermons which have been prayed over, thought out, worked out, polished off, and put into final form for their delivery by the pastor himself. For while we often hear from our pulpits good, soundly doctrinal sermons, which are both instructive and edifying, yea, at times most inspiring, the making of the sermon has all too often been but a gleaning from what other men have thought through and developed. And so, while those who hear the sermon may go home strengthened and encouraged for the tasks ahead of them in the coming week, the pastor will limp home looking for crutches on which to steady himself when he again ascends the pulpit. The sermon will not have proved as helpful to the preacher himself as it would have proved had he faithfully labored over theme and divisions as their originator and perfecter himself.

While I do not deny that there may be times when it may become both justifiable and necessary to make use of another man's development of a given text, that must not be made the *rule*, but ever remain the *rare exception*. For what will be the result if we as preachers are ever leaning on another theologian's thoughts and applications of a given text? We shall remain more or less helpless children, never getting beyond the "Kiddy-Kar" stage. Or, as Scripture more aptly puts it: "When for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk and not of strong meat." Heb. 5:12. When it is demanded of us that we stand on our own feet, we shall toddle about as those who have never quite learned the sturdy art of walking with sure and steady step. Such preachers remind me of a good old German we had down in the State of Texas. He had become so used to relying on the sage counsel and direction of his faithful wife that when occasion demanded that he give his own opinion on some vital question and that wife was not at hand, he would invariably cry out more or less in despair: "I vish Mary vas here, dat's vat I hope!"

Now, why is it so necessary that the individual pastor sweat and labor over the text all by himself? If he does not, he will never become the *Seelsorger* he ought to be, will never be ready to give an unhesitating account of his faith in moments of crisis, will never have the unswerving conviction in matters of doctrine and practice which God expects of everyone to whom has been entrusted the shepherding of His flock. In conferences, at conventions, at colloquiums, he will all too often be looking for guidance and direction from some trusted leader, instead of standing on his own feet. That is why in times of stress for the Church, when individual conviction based on the inviolable Word itself is at a premium, men will often be looking about for the guidance which is not there. Even the Lutheran Church has had, and will no doubt continue to have, its wavering Melanchthons, who will prove the undoing of our Church unless there be among clergy and laity those who, like Caleb of old, having another spirit with him, followed the Lord fully. Num. 14:24. The reason we have so much confusion in our midst today relative to doctrinal matters on the question of unionism is due to the fact that all too many pastors within our Synodical Conference are relying entirely too much upon leadership and doing very little individual study on the points involved. "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man and maketh flesh his arm and whose heart departeth from the Lord." Jer. 17:5. While we must always bear in mind that Scripture itself enjoins upon us the sacred duty to "remember them which have the rule over us, who have spoken unto us the word of God, whose faith follow, considering the end of

their conversation" (Heb. 13:7), that very injunction places upon us as individuals the responsibility of knowing what the Word of God says.

"But what has this to do with homiletics?" you ask. It has very much to do in every way. For as a pastor works in his study, so he will very likely do his work in general. It was sage counsel which the English divine gave when he said: "When you come into a pastor's home where the carpet is worn thin in front of the mirror, pray for that pastor. But if you find that the carpet is become threadbare where the pastor labors over his sermons, get that pastor to pray for you."

Before entering upon a discussion of the more mechanical parts of sermon making, there are certain fundamental truths upon which I desire to dwell in brief. The first of these is the apostolic injunction: "*Let no man despise thy youth.*" 1 Tim. 4:12. While we as younger men should ever bear in mind that there is a Fourth Commandment, which enjoins upon us due respect for our elders, that respect must never take the form of silence when truth is at stake. For silence then, so far from being a virtue, becomes a grievous sin.

To sin by silence, when we should protest,
Makes cowards out of men;
The human race has climbed on protest.
Had no voice been raised against
Injustice, ignorance, and lust,
The Inquisition yet would serve the law,
And guillotines decide our last disputes.

The second fundamental truth is this: "*If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God.*" 1 Pet. 4:11. The word for "oracles" in the original is "logia," that which is *uttered, spoken, revealed*. This does not mean that we must simply repeat verbatim what God in His Word of truth has uttered, but it means that it must all be based upon that divine Word and be in strict accord with it. It will therefore always be an excellent rule to follow, that when you have discoursed upon some definite doctrines, you do not leave the question until you have quoted directly from Scripture itself the very words which cover the point in question. Then your hearers will know that you have spoken as you have because "thus saith the Lord."

And the third fundamental truth to which I would point is the very last word we have from the pen of Peter: "But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." 2 Pet. 3:18. For unless you grow in grace and in the knowledge of Him who must ever be the lodestar in all your preaching, you may preach ever so eloquently, ever so interestingly, ever so brilliantly, but you are not going to preach *saving* sermons. May it never be said by any of your hearers at the end of any of your sermons: "We would see Jesus." It is told of an American who was visiting

at the time when the two most talked-of preachers in that metropolis were Joseph Parker and Charles H. Spurgeon, that he went to hear both of them. After hearing the brilliant Parker in his pulpit at the City Temple, he spoke to one of the ushers as he left the place of worship: "What a wonderful *preacher* you have here." On the following Sunday, after having heard Spurgeon in his Tabernacle, he said to the usher on leaving: "What a wonderful *Savior* you have here." And that alone will be effective preaching which leaves the hearers not marveling at the gifts and abilities of the one who has preached but which makes them adoringly look up to a Savior which has evidently been set forth, crucified among them. Gal. 3:1.

But now regarding the preparation of the sermon itself.

1. If you are able to make use of the original texts, whether they be Hebrew or Greek, do not fail to consult them, even though you may not in every instance be able to make use of them directly. Usually the original texts will give you pointers which will prove very helpful in your sermon preparation. It is seldom that a Walther, for instance, refers to any specific word from the original, but he most certainly indicates that he has made use of it.

2. The very first thing you want to do when you have thoroughly acquainted yourself with the text (and that means that you also have consulted the parallel passages), is to strive to get at the nub of it and to state your theme in as catchy a way as possible. When I say catchy, I use that word in its better sense. Do not seek to be sensational in your selection of a theme, but let it be of such a nature that no one, after having heard it stated, shall have the right to think within himself: "Well, I know what is coming, so I may just as well settle back for a much-needed nap." No, make the theme so strikingly interesting that the hearer will be prompted to say to himself: "That's a question I most certainly will want to hear answered." And since in our day there are very few pastors who have not at their disposal some local paper, especially in the smaller towns, it is well to submit with your announcement of text and theme a brief sentence which gathers within it the central truth of the text or at least touches upon a vital part of the text. It should give your parishioners an idea of what they may have a right to expect in their pastor's sermon the coming Sunday. It has this very salutary value that it makes you think upon what you are to preach about quite early in the week, for announcements usually have to be in by Tuesday morning. It's a good antidote to that all-too-common pastoral weakness — *laziness*.

To sum up this paragraph: Put much time and thought upon your theme. If the great newspapers consider it worth while to employ men whose one duty it is to summarize the day's most

important news item in one pithy sentence splashed across the front page of the paper, certainly it ought to be worth some effort on our part to formulate that "good news" which we are to proclaim in such a way that it shall elicit attention.

3. Every well-prepared sermon ought to have an introduction. I know that there are those preachers who have an aversion to what is generally termed thematic preaching and who argue that you ought to make your sermon an *in medias res iacere* affair. But I also know that for my own part I like to have at least an enlightening introduction, a definite theme, and a logical conclusion. They serve as a handle with which I can carry the sermon home with me and not lose grip of its contents too early in the week.

But what is to be the nature of the introduction? It must lead from the text into the theme. Otherwise it serves no useful purpose. But what, in essence, is to be its contents? Wherever it is possible, it is well that in your introduction (when you are preaching on a Gospel or an Epistle text) you make use of some Old Testament story. For our hearers need to become acquainted also with what the Prophets had to say. If that were not the case, why would we find the apostolic preachers so often resorting to this very thing? Or, if not from the Old Testament story, make use of some well-known historic fact which will serve the purpose. Just by way of illustration: If preaching on a text like Rom. 8:1 ("There is therefore now no condemnation," etc), I would use as my theme: "The Man Whom God Cannot Curse." As my introduction to that theme I would make use of the story of Balak and Balaam, Num. 22. Or, as an instance of a Gospel text, the account of Christ's temptation in the wilderness, you might well use as your theme "The Real Battle of the Wilderness," introducing that by a narration of the well-known closing campaign of our Civil War. If you want to use as the theme for your Easter sermon: "How Do You Punctuate the Easter Message?" (which, by the way, is not an indifferent theme), you might introduce that by showing the importance of proper punctuation. A man's fortune (as in the case of a Joseph Leiter) may be ruined by the improper placement of a comma. Or a man's life might depend upon it.

4. Your sermon must not only be *zeitgemaess*, but it must be *textual*. Yes, there are indeed many truths set forth in the Bible, but you must confine yourself to the truth which is presented in the text you have before you. You must not preach *about* the Law and the Gospel, but preach Law and Gospel. There is in only too many sermons a mere moralizing about the Law. And that will never convict of sin. Conviction of sin is, of course, the Law's primary purpose. "Every mouth must be stopped and all the world become guilty before God." Rom. 3:19. So preach the Law that the

gates of heaven are slammed shut in the face of everyone. For we shall never get a better definition of what it means to preach Christ Crucified than that which our sainted Walther has given us: "So to preach the Law that it drives the greatest saint to despair; so to preach the Gospel that it gives the greatest sinner hope."

Your main objective must, of course, be to comfort poor sinners. You really have no other calling. It is only accidental, "a foreign work," as our Confessions put it, when Christ preaches the Law. But it *must* be preached in all its damning enormity. For again, to quote Walther: "Without the Law, no one would appreciate the Gospel: Without the Gospel, the Law would profit us nothing." But make sure that you in your description of a believer make room for those poor souls who have not gotten farther than the father of the boy with a dumb spirit, who cried almost in despair: "Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief." Mark 9:24. "Do not, for God's sake," cries Walther, "draw a false picture of a Christian; but whenever you have drawn the picture of a Christian, see whether you can recognize yourself in that picture." And it won't hurt your hearers to note that the very grace of God which you proclaim with faith's true abandon, is a grace after which you yourself are reaching out with trembling hands.

5. "What about sermon material?" you ask. You must, of course, know your Bible. And when you quote from Scripture, be sure it is correct. Look up each passage. Then our precious Confessions, which are all too commonly being neglected in our day. And don't forget that our faithful old members will not object to hearing some of the Catechism truths interwoven into the body of the sermon. I know from my own early years in the ministry how I was anxious to get at something which could provide me "immediate help." For my concern was to be able to put down in black and white so many thousand words. I used to think that Luther was rather verbose and at times beside the point. But I had not as yet learned to know Luther. Whatever you do, don't neglect the great Reformer in your sermon preparation. If you have not as yet been able to supply yourself with his "Saemtliche Schriften," see to it that you begin without delay saving your pin money for that one objective. And read Luther daily, whether it be for the sermon you are struggling with or for the more general purpose of coming to a more perfect appreciation of the Gospel. I doubt that there has ever been a preacher since apostolic times who has so lived, moved, and had his being in the unconditioned Gospel as Martin Luther. Now, I am not against your reading of other good sermon material, remember. But that must be left until you have worked out the complete sketch of your sermon. For otherwise it will very likely go with you as it did with me: After having

read what a Walther had to say on a given text, I simply didn't know how to treat it otherwise.

And don't forget your hymnbook. You will find that there is no better way of approach to a dying member than to be able to recite or sing for him or her some treasured hymn learned in the days of their youth. And why shouldn't our members know where a particular hymn stanza fits in with eminent force on some vital truth you are expounding? It simply isn't true that you cannot learn to quote with effect hymn stanzas in your sermons. The greatest hindrance you will have to overcome is that ever-present "hang-about" — *laziness*.

6. Nor should profane literature be ignored. While it is true that he who preaches must preach as the oracles of God, it is also true that they who did preach thus in apostolic times did not refuse to make use of profane literature. Paul, especially, shows that he is not a stranger to the prevalent philosophies of his day. If it can serve no other purpose, it may prove an excellent base against which operations of attack may be made. For the vain talkers and deceivers must be met squarely with the truth which alone can make us free.

But while the gleanings from profane literature will seldom supply us with much real material for a thoroughly doctrinal sermon, there are exceptions, *e. g.*, Lowell's section of his *Present Crisis* which reads thus: "Truth forever on the scaffold," etc. Shakespeare has occasionally some good theology. For instance, Portia's speech: "The quality of mercy is not strained," etc. Milton may be made use of to good effect, especially his *Paradise Lost*. Or John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. I shall ever be thankful to my sainted pastor because he so often elucidated portions of his sermons with Aesop's Fables. Though spoken well-nigh fifty years ago, I shall never forget how he drove home the point that "Undank ist der Welt Lohn" by relating the simple story of the farmer who took pity upon the benumbed viper, which after it had been warmed at the hearth, fatally bit the farmer's little child. In the Norwegian, Ibsen, in spite of the fact that he is not exactly an example of orthodoxy, has many a striking passage which may well be made use of in your sermons. What could be more to the point than what in his drama *Brand* he says about the world's conception of love?

Hvad verden kalder kjærlighed
Jeg ikke vil og ikke ved;
Guds kjærlighed jeg kjender til,
Og den er ikke veg og mild;
Den er til dodens rædsel haard,
Den byder klappe saa det slaar, etc.

It is well for any pastor to have a file for what I, in my files, have listed as "Worth-while Poems." Just by way of illustration:

When defining the Christian virtue of humility, which Luther calls "the mother of all virtues," what could be more fitting than this little gem from the pen of Tryon Edwards:

Humility, the fairest, loveliest flower
That grew in Paradise, and the first that died,
Has rarely flourished since on mortal soil.
It is so frail, so delicate a thing,
'Tis gone, if it but look upon itself;
And they who venture to believe it theirs
Prove by that single thought they have it not.

Or what can be a more touching tribute to what Paul inculcates in Rom. 8:28, than this thoroughly Christian concept of absolute trust in God, which an anonymous poet has termed faith:

I will not doubt, though all my ships at sea
Come drifting home with broken masts and sails;
I will believe the hand which never fails,
From seeming evil worketh good for me.
And though I weep because those sails are tattered,
Still will I cry, while my best hopes lie shattered:
I trust in Thee.

I will not doubt, though all my prayers return
Unanswered from the still, white realm above;
I will believe it is an all-wise love
That has refused these things for which I yearn;
And though at times I cannot keep from grieving,
Yet the pure ardor of my fixed believing
Undimmed shall burn.

I will not doubt, though sorrows fall like rain,
And troubles swarm like bees about a hive;
I will believe the heights for which I strive
Are only reached by anguish and by pain;
And though I groan and writhe beneath my crosses,
I yet shall see through my severest losses
The greater gain.

I will not doubt. Well anchored is this faith;
Like some staunch ship, my soul braves every gale,
So strong its courage that it will not quail
To breast the mighty unknown sea of death.
Oh, may I cry, though body parts with spirit,
I do not doubt, so listening worlds may hear it,
With my last breath.

But let me not close until I have at least given a few of Luther's excellent admonitions regarding sermon preparation and preaching: Let us ever bear in mind his: *Bene orasse, bene studuisse*. And in fairness to our hearers, let us not fail to remember Luther's classic remark: "Ein Prediger soll diese drei Tugenden haben: Erstlich soll er koennen auftreten, zum andern soll er nicht stilleschweigen, zum dritten soll er auch wieder aufhoeren koennen." Or, as we were taught it at our Seminary in my day: "Frisch auf, Maul auf, und hoer bald auf." And finally: "Gott moege uns vor den Predigern behueten, die allen Leuten gefallen!"

Princeton, Minn.

NORMAN A. MADSON

Outlines on Old Testament Texts (Synodical Conference)

Sunday After New Year

Lam. 3:22-33

The preacher may make a few remarks on the poetic form and beauty, in particular on the sequence of content, of the five elegies. Feeling the faith of the author, the pastor will cast his hearers' mind into the form of the book, and as the prophet practices on the ruins of Jerusalem, so the pastor preaches — having learned the practice before — in view of the past year and present day on

The Art of God-Pleasing Lamenting

1

It can be practiced by a Christian only.

A. The prophet's lamentations express (1) a prayer to God, vv. 23, 41, 55 f.; 2:20; 5:1; (2) an acknowledgment of God's justice in casting off, causing grief, afflicting, vv. 31-33, 39, 42, and of God's compassion, abundant mercies, faithfulness, vv. 31-33, 22, 23; (3) submission to the correcting rod, vv. 27-30; (4) hope, vv. 24, 26, 29; patience, vv. 25-28; perseverance, vv. 27-30; (5) praise and glorification of God in mourning and by mourning. The text, therefore, proves to be the climax of Lamentations, sparkling with cheer and happiness in spiritual light — a paradox like 2 Cor. 6:9b, 10a — supernatural.

B. To praise God while pining is an art, seemingly simple and easy, requiring only that we address to the right Person the right words in the right spirit and right measure with the right purpose in mind. Who qualifies? (1) We complain when we ought to praise, or we lament beyond measure, hysterically, or below measure, stoically. Mostly our lamentations do not conform to the facts involved. Would Job have begun his complaint with a curse (Job 3:3) or Jacob wailed comfortless (Gen. 27:35) if they had known the full facts, each of his case? (2) The heavenly Father wants us to learn the art of lamenting; but many children do not want to practice, and all His children find the art to be extremely difficult. None learns it to perfection because of the element of the flesh and of ignorance. The Bible calls our imperfection in this art our infirmity, Rom. 8:26.

C. Yet the text presents the perfect product. It is given by inspiration of God. The Lord's willing disciples, who learn of Him, Matt. 11:29, have the promise and comfort of Rom. 8:26, 27. After all, then, our lamenting reaches the heart of God in perfection by the operation of the Holy Spirit through the mercies of

Christ. On earth He instructs our hearts by His Word, that we humbly acknowledge the justice of God's Law, but accept the comforts of the Gospel and live according to Rom. 12:12; and in heaven, before God, and in our behalf, He forms and fashions our complaints into acceptable prayers and praises and removes the mistakes of our infirmity.

D. Hence the noble art of lamenting is far beyond the ability of the unbelievers. It is a spiritual, supernatural art. In his helpless confusion the unbeliever's grumbling grows to growling and blasphemy against the Almighty. It is noise, not music; sinful, not godly; despair, not trust in the Lord. The Christian only has the aptitude, practices the art, and is conscious of this particular talent (saith my soul, v. 24).

2

The Christian practices it to the glory of God.

Occasion for lamenting: (1) Jeremiah refers to the ruins of Jerusalem; we see the ruins of the old year. (2) He refers to the condition of the Church; we have reason to be concerned for its present state. (3) As Jeremiah, so we look upon our past as we have deserved it, and into our personal, national, spiritual future as we have deserved it. Our lamentations, in truth referring to us, cannot be voiced to our credit and glory.

Our penitential psalm of praise: (1) The prophet calls himself and all the blameworthy to repentance. We practice the art of lamenting by true repentance, Luke 22:62. (2) He praises the heart and acts of God, the faithfulness and compassion revealed in His acts of mercy. We practice the art of lamenting by measuring our sobbing for consideration and praise of God's heart and mercies. (3) He meekly recognizes the value of affliction, vv. 27-30. Heb. 12:5, 6, 11; Rom. 5:3-5. We practice the art of lamenting by drying our tears for a time to glorify God's wisdom and purpose in afflicting us. (4) The seer peers through tears into the bright future, vv. 23, 25, 26, 31-33. Luke 21:18, 19, 28; Matt. 24:13, 22. We practice the art of lamenting by arresting our grief by trust in the promise of deliverance, and thus we glorify God.

This sacred art is not too difficult, if we turn for further help and direction to the penitential psalms and to the psalms of praise, to the five elegies of Jeremiah, in particular to our text. This is God-pleasing lamenting, which He blesses. John 4:46, 47; Matt. 15:21-28; Ps. 56:8-10.

G. H. SMUKAL

Epiphany

Is. 60:1-11

Epiphany is the Christmas of the Gentiles. The standard festive Gospel lesson tells of the coming of the first Gentiles to worship the Christ child. To us, who are descendants of Gentiles,

Epiphany should be a festival of far greater importance than many regard it. We have reason to praise the wondrous grace of God manifested to the Gentiles. It impresses upon us also our paramount work as children of God:

The Glorious Work of Mission

1. *God has prepared us for the work*
2. *God richly blesses our work*

1

The great seer envisioned the New Testament Church. He foresaw the manifestation of the light, which would dispel the gloom and darkness through which the Old Testament Church was passing. Old Testament believers longed for the passing of the night. Their eyes were riveted in hope upon the approaching Morning Star, the Sun of Righteousness.

The sin of man had enveloped the earth in darkness, ignorance, sorrow, v. 2. Impossible for man to dispel "gross darkness." Sin had separated man from God, the only source of light; hence "darkness."

God is the Light—"glory of the Lord," v. 1. In Him is no darkness. Wherever God manifests Himself, there is brightness and glory, and all darkness must vanish.

God sent His Son to be the Light. Is. 9:2; John 1:5-9; 8:12; 12:35, etc. John especially emphasizes this. On the Mount of Transfiguration he "beheld His glory." Christ removed the cause of darkness, sin.

The Holy Spirit brought us to the Light, called us out of darkness, 1 Pet. 2:9, hath shined in our hearts, 2 Cor. 4:6; Eph. 1:18. Knowledge of faith in Christ is light, dispels darkness, and brings joy and gladness, because sin is removed.

Those who have been brought to the Light have become lights. John 5:14-16; Acts 13:47; 1 Pet. 2:9. The Light is come to them, and light will come from them. They will reflect the Light. "Arise, shine!" V. 1. Christians do this by their witness bearing, Acts 1:8, either by oral confessions or by their life and conduct.

2

There certainly is much need for mission work. Despite nineteen centuries of Gospel preaching, distribution of Bibles in over a thousand languages in whole or in part, tracts, etc., there is still much ignorance, sorrow, darkness.

The light, however, reflected by Christians, placed on a candlestick will attract people's attention, and many will approach the Light. Isaiah foresaw this, and he states that the Church shall see, vv. 4, 5, a great number coming to the Light: Gentiles, kings,

v. 3; "all they," v. 4; "the abundance of the sea," "the forces of the Gentiles," v. 5; "the multitude of camels," v. 6; "all the flocks of Kedar," v. 7; etc. What wonderful promises of successful mission work! How wonderfully fulfilled beginning with the coming of the Wise Men to Bethlehem and continued throughout the centuries!

The Prophet foresaw that all classes of men shall come. They shall come from near and far. They shall come with rich gifts and offerings, "their silver and their gold," vv. 6, 9. They shall come to show forth the praises of the Lord, v. 6. They shall help in the building of the Church, v. 10. Wonderful success!

The success of missions results, on the one hand, in great excitement and joy among God's people, v. 5. God's people eagerly lift up their eyes to see, vv. 4, 8; John 4:35, and rejoice over the salvation of blood-bought souls. On the other hand, God's people look for further opportunities to win souls for Christ. They will keep the gates open, v. 11, and seek to bring men unto the Light.

God grant unto all of us the preparation, ability, and willingness for missionary activity and the joy of success!

J. W. BEHNKEN

First Sunday After Epiphany

Ps. 78:1-7

The psalm from which our text is taken gives very important instruction. The opening words are an earnest direction to all Christian parents.

Christian Parents, Make Known to Your Children the Wonderful Works of God

1. *God earnestly wills it*
2. *Your children's welfare demands it*
3. *Your Church's future requires it*

1

V.1. Let us not lose sight of the fact that the psalmist is a prophet of God. Christ Himself designates him as such, Matt. 13:35, quoting v. 2. And we know that the Spirit of Christ was in the prophets, 1 Pet. 1:11. In the name of the Lord the psalmist addresses especially parents. They are to incline their ears to the words of his mouth. He reminds them of what their fathers told them, v. 3, in compliance with the Lord's command, vv. 4, 5; Deut. 6:7; 4:9; Ex. 12:26, 27. The purpose of such instruction is shown in v. 7.

This command of the Lord is in force today, Eph. 6:4. You are Christians, who love their Savior, John 14:15; 1 John 5:1-3.

You would have considered it an affront to your Savior and a disgrace to your Christian profession if you had not soon after birth brought your children to Baptism in accordance with the will of Him who has done so much for you. And so you will consider it base ingratitude to refuse or neglect obedience when He calls upon you to make known to your children the works of the Lord. You will not consider this an arduous task but a delightful privilege and will gladly place yourselves into His service.

2

Vv. 3, 4. The implication is that irreparable harm will come to our children if we withhold from them the wonderful works of God, especially God's redemption of mankind.

This fact should fill us with very great concern. To be sure, our children should be enabled to become intelligent and loyal citizens, etc. But we must not make the very serious mistake of placing last things first and first things last, Matt. 6:44; 16:26. What if our children have an abundance of earthly possessions, but are not rich in God? What if they are decked with silks and satins but do not have the cloak of Christ's righteousness? Is. 61:10; Matt. 22:11-13. No comfort in life, no hope in death.

Parents, acquaint your children with the great events recorded in the Bible, especially with Christ's life and death, resurrection, ascension, return to Judgment; show them what all this means to them for their temporal and eternal welfare.

Your children have become children of God in Baptism, Gal. 3:26. But they must be brought to a conscious faith in Christ, their Savior. Their knowledge of sin (Rom. 3:20; Gen. 8:21; Rom. 7:18) and grace (Rom. 3:23, 24; Eph. 1:7) must be increased and deepened. They should be enabled to find comfort in every sorrow; always to give an answer to every man, etc. (1 Pet. 3:15), to defend their faith in the face of gainsayers, to stand firm over against seducing spirits (1 Tim. 4:1; Rom. 16:17; 1 John 4:1), to resist every temptation to sin and to walk in all things pleasing unto God (Rom. 12:1, 2).

Begin early! Mother, tell that little child upon your lap of the love of Jesus, teach it to pray to the loving Savior! Father, do not leave all this to your wife, do not consider it beneath your dignity to do the same! Family devotion. If you have not yet begun, begin now. It can be conducted in this way—. Then use every helpful agency provided by the Church: Sunday school, Saturday school, summer school, especially day school, Bible class. Do not only send your children to church, take them and worship with them. What if the Lord should ask on the Last Day: Where are thy children?

3

Vv. 4, 6. The Lord is very much concerned about the future generation, and He here makes them your concern. If you take this lightly, you should take stock of your own Christianity.

What will become of the Christian Church if you and your fellow Christians neglect to do whatever you can to perpetuate it? True, the Lord has promised: Matt. 16:18; 1 Kings 19:18, but He has not given this promise to any one organization. Vv. 4, 6, 7. Remember Luther's warning to the German people of his time. You know what has happened in Germany. Will our Church endure if we do not give to our children a thorough Christian education and training, so that they will be able to transmit what they have heard to coming generations that they might set their hope in God, etc.? V. 7. Indifferentism, unionism, worldliness, are even now making themselves all too strongly felt.

Christian fathers and mothers, let us bestir ourselves and make known, etc. God will bless our efforts for the glory of His name, for the welfare of our children, and for the perpetuation of our dear Church, in which Christ is still enthroned in all His glory as the Savior of mankind.

R. NEITZEL

Second Sunday After Epiphany

Ps. 104:24-35

The Aims: 1. To awaken a realization of the sins whereby we despise God's goodness in the kingdom of nature.

2. To comfort with the divine assurance that by grace through faith in Christ, these sins are forgiven.

3. To use this comforting assurance as the incentive for putting away these sins, and for replacing them with songs of prayer and praise.

The Introit strikes the keynote of the day. By the words of the psalm "Make a joyful noise unto God, all ye lands" we are called upon to "praise the Lord . . . for His wonderful works among the children of men" (Gradual). How fitting our text, in which the psalmist calls upon us:

Praise the Lord for His Goodness to Us in the Kingdom of Nature!

1

Let us behold the works of God in creation and preservation.

A. In creation.

a. V. 24. On earth—the hills and valleys, the streams and lakes, the lilies of the field, the stars and planets in their courses,

the countless infinitesimal creatures, the birds and animals, and, above all, mankind. We think also of the rich deposits of coal, oil, and ore, so precious today. Rubber, so vital to transportation. Electricity. The radio. And what untapped resources yet to be discovered! Truly, as the psalmist says, "the earth is full of Thy riches," v. 24c. There is also the "great and wide sea," v. 25, each drop of its vast waters a world of life in itself. On it "go the ships," v. 26a — then sailing craft, now steamers and Diesel-driven dreadnaughts. In it "leviathan," i. e., "the monster of the sea" (Gesenius). How manifold God's works on land and in the sea!

b. "In wisdom hast Thou made them all," v. 24b. Consider the intricate design, the structural perfection, of each work in God's creation, e. g., the snowflake, the leaf, the tree, above all, the human body. David Grant, the noted anatomist, while dissecting a human body, called it an "inexplicable miracle," and his remarks on that occasion cured Dr. Orrin Keating of atheism. (*Reader's Digest*, November, 1942, p. 57.) Surely, "I am fearfully and wonderfully made," Ps. 139:14.

B. In preservation.

a. He supplies the needs of all He has made, vv. 27, 28; Matt. 6:26-34; 10:29-31. He provides even for the pleasure of His creatures, v. 26: "to play therein." According to the Sunday's Gospel, Jesus made wine for a wedding.

b. All life depends on Him, and He takes it again, v. 29; Job 1:21.

c. He grants new life by the miracle of reproduction, so manifest in spring, v. 30.

d. And all these things he does *for us*. "He richly and daily provides *me* with all that *I* need to support this body and life." How good of Him! What shall I do about it?

2

Let us thank and praise God for these things with our hearts and lives.

a. We ought to praise Him, since these works are created and preserved for God's enduring glory and joy, v. 31 (note the original: "Let the Lord rejoice . . ."), and God threatens to punish those who misuse His creation and thus dishonor Him and pervert the purpose of His works, v. 32; earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, floods, droughts, famines, *war*. (Aim 1.)

b. The Lord expects us to sing His praises as long as we live, v. 33; to bring joy to Him by our meditations, v. 34 (literally: "Let my meditations be pleasing to Him"), and to rejoice in His works, v. 34b. With Luther we therefore confess: "For all which it is my duty," etc. But do we do this? Always? Are we not often

guilty of neglected prayers and vain repetitions, of sin and ingratitude? (Aim 1.)

c. God wants us to praise Him by the removal of sin from the earth, v. 35. But are we putting away *our* sins? What about indifference to God and worship, disobedience to parents and authority, hatred, lust, adultery, covetousness in word and deed? (Aim 1.)

Conclusion: We have seen God's wonderful works of creation and preservation, but we have recognized also our many sins in failing to give proper praise to the Lord for His goodness to us. What shall we do about these sins? Let us flee to Jehovah, the God of the covenant, of grace and mercy in Christ. In today's Collect we pray: "*Mercifully . . . grant us Thy peace.*" (Aim 2.) How gracious of God to grant us the knowledge of this grace today, in this sermon! Oh, may this mercy of our Lord persuade us to put away our sins and to replace them with songs of prayer and praise, blessing the Lord with our hearts and in our lives for His marvelous goodness to us in the realm of nature! (Aim 3.)

THEO. F. NICKEL

Third Sunday After Epiphany

Dan. 6:10-23

The time in which Daniel lived bore many points of resemblance to our own. That great prophet and statesman lived in days of deepest national misery and degradation of his own people Israel. He lived to see the rise and fall of world powers and visioned more.

In all this time Daniel towers a heroic figure of faith, a source of comfort and help to his own people and of unquestioned loyalty to his earthly masters. His unswerving loyalty to his God brought him safely through all the trying vicissitudes of his time.

Daniel's Unswerving Loyalty to His God

1. *How this loyalty was reflected in his illustrious career*
2. *How God graciously vindicated this loyalty*

1

A. Review briefly from preceding chapters what is necessary to lead up to the situation described in text.

B. a) V. 10. Daniel's loyalty to God. "Windows being open in his chamber toward Jerusalem." Cf. 1 Kings 8:30, 48. In the Temple God had revealed Himself in all His majesty and love. Not all the glamour of a heathen court nor the honors and responsibilities to which he had attained had ever erased from the heart

of Daniel the glorious things he had seen and heard in his boyhood days in the Temple. There all the worship pointed to the wondrous love of God which had made Israel a great nation and the custodian of His gracious promises of the Messiah, the salvation of a lost world. Through this Savior heaven should be opened to all. Indelibly the Holy Spirit's grace had impressed this wondrous love of God upon the youthful heart. To this God, Daniel was resolved to remain ever loyal.

b) This loyalty reflected throughout his life in the land of captivity:

1. In his refusal to defile himself, chap. 1:8. (Cf. Weimarsche Bibel, note on chap. 1:8.)

2. In his refusal to obey the royal decree forbidding prayer to God, v. 10. Cp. Acts 5:29.

3. In his relationship to God's people, Israel, whom he called and led to repentance, chap. 9, and whom he comforted with his prophecies of the Messiah. No doubt, by his great influence at court he contributed much toward making Israel's lot in captivity tolerable and toward their final release under Cyrus. To the great cause of his people, the true Church on earth, he remained devoted though all the cares and burdens of state rested upon him.

4. In his loyalty to his earthly masters, like Joseph of old, v. 14 f. Mindful of Jer. 29:7.

c) Application: Amid the din and confusion of a war-torn world let us ever remain loyal to our God. Whether Christians, like Daniel, be far from home, in their country's service at home or abroad; whether they be in cares, toils, and anxieties of the home front, let them ever keep "windows open toward Jerusalem." May they never forget the true God and His love, their baptismal covenant, their confirmation vows, the blessings of a Christian home, and their home church. May they reflect their loyalty to God, as did Daniel, in all their life. The various points listed under b) lend themselves readily to practical application.

2

Chap. 9:23. Through faith Daniel was in possession of the great God's grace and favor, an inestimable treasure, which vouched for blessings in time and in eternity. Rom. 8:32.

A. As Joseph of old, so Daniel was signally blessed of God in the land of captivity; chaps. 1-6 furnish abundant material.

B. Particularly was Daniel's loyalty to his God vindicated in time of danger and persecution. As wonderfully as his like-minded friends had experienced God's protection in the fiery furnace,

chap. 3, so Daniel's faith was vindicated by the glorious deliverance from the lions, vv. 19-23.

C. Daniel lived to see the return of his people to the homeland under Cyrus. God's promise fulfilled. While Daniel himself for obvious reasons (old age, greater usefulness, etc.) did not return, yet the even of his life was cheered by the word of his faithful God recorded in the closing words of his book, chap. 12:13. Rest for his body in the quiet bosom of the earth. Glorious and certain hope of resurrection to eternal life in heaven.

D. Application: Thus God ever vindicates the faith and loyalty of His own. 1 Tim. 4:8. Hymn 437:1 (new hymnal).

AUG. F. BERNTHAL

Fourth Sunday After Epiphany

1 Kings 19:9-18

In this season of Epiphany, of the manifestation of God's glory in Christ, our text presents one of the most majestic manifestations of God recorded in the Bible. This manifestation was granted to Elijah on Mount Horeb, perhaps in the same cleft where five hundred years before Moses had stood and seen the glory of the Lord pass before him, Ex. 33:18 to 34:8. Let us study our text.

God Manifesting Forth His Glory

1. *With destructive power of His just judgment*
2. *With the life-giving grandeur of His saving mercy*

1

Elijah, the fearless prophet of the true God and undaunted opponent of idolatry, 1 Kings 17:1; 18:1; 2 Kings 1, had fled to escape the wrath of Jezebel and save his life for further service of the Lord. Cp. Matt. 10:23. On his flight, despair seized him. He grew weary of life, chap. 19:4. At the question of the Lord, v. 9, he pours out his grievances. In answer the Lord in a marvelous manifestation of His power passes by him, and as His messenger sends stormwind, earthquake, fire. Failing to understand this manifestation, Elijah repeats his question, v. 14. The Lord interprets the vision, vv. 15-17. Hazael shall sweep like a stormwind over God's enemies; Jehu shall be as an earthquake, bringing ruin and disaster to the house of Ahab; Elisha shall with the fiery law of God (cap. Deut. 33:2; Jer. 23:29), condemn and deliver up to everlasting fire all enemies of God who had escaped the sword of Hazael and Jehu. And Elijah shall be the agent through whom the instruments of God's vengeance shall be called and anointed.

The twentieth century is a century of apostasy from God. Powerful enemies within and without the Church seek, like Ahab and Jezebel, to destroy the Church and silence the voice of the Gospel. The number of apostates is legion. Money, position, pleasure, their own flesh, are the idols before whom many so-called Christians bow. That is the reason why the Lord is manifesting His supreme power by visiting the earth with His judgments. Global warfare against God is punished by global warfare among the nations. Empires are tottering; whole nations are being wiped out. Millions are being killed in bloody battles, by famine and pestilence. Poverty and immorality are spreading more rapidly every day. The Lord is fulfilling Ex. 20:5; Jer. 14:1-4, 18; 15:1-3, 7-9; Nah. 1:2. Lord, open our eyes that we may turn our hearts to wisdom, cease from sin, and plead for mercy.

2

God manifests the power of His mercy

A. To the individual. While Elijah's flight was not sinful, his despondency was lack of trust in God, a sin against the First Commandment. Yet mercifully God comforts His disconsolate prophet. He has not forgotten Elijah. He appears to him and gives him an opportunity to unburden himself. Similarly God speaks to us in His Word, that still, small voice coming to life in our heart or being called to our memory by the pastor or other fellow Christians.

God assures Elijah that his bloodthirsty enemies, vv. 10, 14, shall not be able to harm him. Elijah himself shall aid in their destruction. We also have the promise of God's help in every time of trouble, Is. 43:1, 2; 1 Pet. 5:10; Heb. 13:6.

Elijah is given an assistant, v. 16b, with whom he may share the joys and sorrows of his ministry. What a blessing to possess and enjoy the fellowship of other Christians! Gen. 2:18a; Phil. 1:8, 25; 2:25 f.; 2 Tim. 4:9-11, 21.

Imbued with fresh courage and new joy, Elijah returns to his work, providing for the schools of prophets (cp. 2 Kings 2:3, 5, 7) and preaching God's Word without fear or favor, 1 Kings 21:17-24; 2 Kings 1:2-16. Let us follow his example.

B. To the Church at large. He preserves it in the darkest day, v. 18, and continues to send His messengers and prophets, v. 16b. The Church shall never perish, because God's omnipotent mercy sustains and builds it, Matt. 16:18. Persecution often serves the spreading of the Gospel, Acts 8:4; 11:19-26. While exterminated perhaps at one place, it will flourish elsewhere. Our work is not vain, 1 Cor. 15:55.

Conclusion: Rom. 11:22; Acts 20:32.

TH. LAETSCH

Fifth Sunday After Epiphany

Gen. 11:1-9

The closing words of the preceding chapter prepare the way for the event described in this text: how the families of the sons of Noah went out to settle in various parts of the earth. That was God's will, chap. 9:1-7. But some of the "children of men," text, v. 5 (distinguished from the "sons of God," chap. 6:2) did not want to scatter; and this led to the building of the Tower of Babel, the event which led to the division of the one race into many nations with different languages. It is a simple piece of history; but there is a very serious lesson in this for us. It may be stated in the words of the old proverb

Man Proposes, but God Disposes**1**

V. 1: "one language," similar modes of thought and action, similar habits and customs, unity of religion, worship of one God. But the "children of men" were not satisfied with this bond of union; they aimed at a permanent external union; this town with its magnificent tower is to be the center.

Note the motives behind this building. A total disregard of God and God's will; God is not mentioned in all their deliberations. No gratitude for His gifts, no desire to use His gifts in His service. They had excluded Him from all their calculations. A deliberate, determined defiance of God's will. God said, Fill the earth. They said, We will remain here. That is the essence of impiety; holiness is another name for obedience to God. (Perhaps even more; the Chaldeans, we know, were at an early date given to worship of the stars; perhaps the object of this tower was practice of idolatry; legend tells that the remains of this tower were used as an observatory.) But at any rate, the unity of religion and worship which God had given them did not suffice them; they wanted to exchange it for an external, self-made, and therefore ungodly, union.—The prime motive is pride: "Let us make us a name"; lust of glory; the tower is to be a center which is to do honor to them. Luther: "They have no concern that God's name be hallowed, but all their care and planning turns to this, that their own name may become great and celebrated on the earth. This city and tower of men is fundamentally nothing else than an outward, artificial substitute for the inner union before God and in God."

It is the first concentrated effort of man against God, his Maker; a God-defying, man-deifying proposal. It is oft repeated. Disregarding Him from whom all blessings flow, men abuse these blessings; first turn away from God, separating from the congre-

gation of Christians, turning to the society of the ungodly; laying their own material foundations for their work instead of God's; then revolting against God, not only in words but also in actions: molesting, persecuting the Church and its work; setting up their idols in place of God, usually, in the last analysis, themselves and their own desire; in their pride and solely for their own glory undertaking gigantic enterprises, in which they disregard all principles of right and wrong, transgress every command of God, and ruthlessly override the rights and interests of all others.

Babel has become a name for pride, show, vainglory; the emblem of insolence against God, its central idea the effort of the restless, scheming human mind to transgress its divinely appointed limitations; but at the same time a symbol of confusion, desolation, of God's judgment, and in consequence the futility and emptiness of human effort if it is divorced from acknowledgment and service of God. Man proposes; but God disposes.

2

V. 5. God not only knows what men are doing but also closely inspects all their work. Let no man think God is ignorant of his wickedness if He delays punishment; in His mercy He does that. But He is intimately acquainted with the thoughts, words, works, and ways of every individual.

V. 6. God is pained not by large, courageous undertakings of men but by the spirit behind them. Whatever derives its inspiration in the least measure from antagonism to God is sin, which the "sons of God" shun and which God must punish.

Vv. 7, 8. And God does punish, often in altogether unexpected ways. Confusing their language, however accomplished, surely unexpected, but effective; the whole undertaking was suddenly abandoned. The most prosperous enterprises often terminate in miserable failure; and the divine verdict on human endeavors often strongly conflicts with man's judgment. So have perished all wicked combinations in the past—mighty empires, public and secret societies, not to forget the antitype of this first Babel, the kingdom of Antichrist. There is a day coming when all that still remains of such ungodly undertakings will be destroyed.

Even in judging God does not forget His mercy. He does not destroy these people, nor does He take His "sons" from the earth, but He leaves them to testify of His divine plan by which all national barriers may be broken down and all men brought back to the family of God. And when the fullness of time was come, God again descended to earth to unite all the discordant speech of the world and in Christ to make all languages one.

Note: Man still proposes, but God still disposes—and leaves us here on earth to bear testimony to that fact. THEO. HOYER

Miscellanea

The Possibility of Miracles

In the July 30, 1942, issue of the *Watchman-Examiner* (Baptist) Prof. William Hazer Wrighton of the Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa., submits a helpful discussion of miracles in an article entitled "Miracles and the Laws of Nature." We reprint a part of the article.

"If we seek the answer to the question, Are miracles possible? we will finally conclude that they are actualities, possible at any time, but occurring only when the Supreme Will would have them. This will work through the medium of the material and living things which it has already created. It is a perfectly reasonable happening, since it is willed by the Supreme Will, and since it is not contrary to any external forces and none of these forces have to be suspended for its operation. 'A "miracle" is not a mere marvel; it is rather an event caused by a direct or immediate exercise of the Supreme Will, acting either above and independent of natural forces, as in creation or in raising the dead — or else in co-operation with natural forces, as in the provision of quail for Israel in the desert; these latter have sometimes been termed "special providences." Let it be clear that evangelical Christianity does not hold that miracles are wrought or produced by simply natural forces alone; if so, they would not be miracles.'

"Some people believe that miracles are impossible because of the 'uniformity of natural laws,' but we must remember that the term 'law' as used here is 'just another name for an apparent usual mode of action — it is not a principle of action, it simply shows how, not why. Put into terms of cause and effect, this "uniformity" means, merely, the same causes, acting under the same conditions, produce the same results; i. e., the course of nature is uniform until causes other than those currently operating intervene. Clearly, this does not prevent the introduction of a new cause or condition at any time. . . . As Professor Albertus Pieters says, "No law of nature is suspended or violated when personal causation is added to natural causation.'" When I raise my hand, I do not contradict the law of gravitation, I transcend it by the law of free personality. Personality is a cause. Moral will is itself a cause; it can initiate.

"Again, uniformity of natural laws involves a creative Intelligence — it can't come from chance. But intelligence involves the power of choice, or will. Hence, nature manifests the will of its supernatural Creator, but only so far as He has established a given sequence for natural occurrences and has instituted the physical causes by which that sequence is secured. Clearly, this cannot limit a further exercise of that will; else you would have the anomaly of the first cause (God) being subject to effect (nature) — a plain absurdity. So, when God further and directly manifests in nature His will — beyond that seen in existing natural laws — you have a miracle. This plainly evidences the essential

freedom of the Divine Will. Accordingly, one who recognizes the fact of a personal God cannot deny the possibility of miracles. In short, the term 'uniform law' does not express an immutable principle according to which events in nature must occur, but is only a name for the manner in which they have been observed to recur.

"The true miracle is added evidence of the superiority of spiritual over material things and a token of that infinite benevolence which seeks to reconcile men to their Maker. Man's dire need and helplessness — even in material matters — would sometimes require an exercise of omnipotent power for redemptive ends. That the Supernatural One has sometimes shown His supernatural power is the more probable after His having already done so in the work of *creation*. Yet, miracles were ever economically used and only at certain great and decisive epochs in the carrying out of the redemptive plan."

Sir (William Matthew) Flinders Petrie

On July 28, 1942, there died in Jerusalem at the advanced age of 89 years "the patriarch of scientific archeology, the man who made ancient Egypt intelligible to the modern world" (cf. *Time*, Aug. 10, 1942).

Great wars usually bring to an end many great peace-time pursuits and among these, missions and archeological excavations. The present world war made it necessary for *Time* to confine its obituary of Sir Flinders Petrie to 27 meager lines. Other periodicals passed him by altogether, so that this prominent English excavator, famous the world over because of his amazing discoveries, died in relative obscurity.

Perhaps this quiet, peaceful departure, unnoticed by the nations now destroying one another, was quite fitting to a man so modest, deeply pious, and altogether oblivious to his own glory as was Sir Petrie. Dr. M. G. Kyle, who knew him well and who at times joined him in his spadework, once told the writer of his great modesty and humility, joined with invincible determination and restless aggressiveness. Early in the morning before taking up the day's task, the men would gather around the camp fire (for Oriental nights are often cool) to read the Scriptures and invoke upon their enterprise God's blessings to His glory.

Modern archeological excavations in Bible lands with rich discoveries so convincing as once for all to stop the mouths of carping, Bible-blaspheming higher critics, certainly belong to God's own self-vindication in this last time of the world's existence, as much perhaps as do the great foreign mission enterprises of this and the last century. Christ's prophecy "And this Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come" (Matt. 24:14) awaited fulfillment, and Christian archeologists have done their share that it might be fulfilled, since they established the reliability of the Bible also in historical and scientific matters. The armchair higher critic who meant to destroy God's Book by his fanciful, but preposterous theories was overcome by the archeologist's spade.

Sir Flinders Petrie lived to be the "patriarch" of all Bible-land diggers. His last years were given largely to the sorting of the abundant material he had dug up and to the array of the overwhelming evidence on be-

half of the truthfulness of the Old Testament. The British *Who's Who* strangely describes his *recreations* as follows: excavating, collecting antiquities, photographing. If these were his avocations, then his vocation consisted in teaching, either *viva voce* or by writing.

Sir Flinders Petrie was born on June 3, 1853, the son of William Petrie, a civil engineer of prominence, and of Anne, daughter of Captain Matthew Flinders, famous Australian explorer.

After having been educated privately, he became interested in archeological research, and between 1875 and 1880 he studied the ancient British remains at Stonehenge and elsewhere. The fruits of this early scientific excavation work were two books, *Inductive Metrology* (1875) and *Stonehenge* (1880). From 1880 to 1924 he excavated in Egypt, beginning with the pyramids at Gizeh and following up this work by excavations at the great Temple at Tanis (1884). He discovered and explored the long-lost Greek city of Naucratis in the Delta (1885) and the ancient towns of Am and Daphnae (1886). Here he found important remains of the time when these places were inhabited by the Pharaohs.

Between 1888 and 1892 he labored in the Fayum, opening such places as Hawara, Kahun, and Lachish. In 1892 he discovered the ancient temple at Medum. Much of this work was done in connection with the Palestine Exploration Fund, and by it he established his reputation as the foremost scientific explorer and archeologist of his time. In 1892 he was elected Edwards professor of Egyptology, University College, London. In 1894 he founded the Egyptian Research Account, which in 1905 was reorganized as the British School of Archeology in Egypt. Perhaps his most important work was that done in connection with the investigation of the site of Memphis. Flinders Petrie was knighted in 1923. He resigned his professorship in 1933.

Besides a long list of monographs on special subjects in his field, he wrote a large number of books on archeological, historical, and anthropological themes. The British *Who's Who* (1933) lists 76 works written by him between 1875 and 1931, and his pen remained busy practically to the time of his death.

Which of his many books is the most important depends largely on the judgment of the individual reader, for at this point the subjective evaluation of his works is decisive. But very popular have been his *Ten Years' Diggings in Egypt* (1893); *History of Egypt* (1894-1905); *Religion and Conscience in Ancient Egypt* (1898); *Hyksos and Israelite Cities* (1906); *Religion of Ancient Egypt* (1906); *Revolution of Civilization* (1911); *Eastern Explorations* (1919); *Religious Life in Ancient Egypt* (1924); *Descriptive Sociology of Ancient Egypt* (1926); *Ancient Gaza* (1931); *Seventy Years in Archaeology* (1931).

In his interesting monograph *The Old Testament and Modern Discovery* Stephen L. Caiger writes: "Modern discovery has shed such a brilliant light upon the Bible that it may almost be said to have rediscovered the Book itself. Of the Old Testament in particular it has given us a clearer and more comprehensive view than was ever possible before and has thus succeeded in making the oldest collections of writings in the world one of the freshest and most fascinating studies of the day" (p. IX).

Sir Flinders Petrie belongs to the great archeologists who have had a large share in accomplishing this noble work. Time is right when it says: "Other archeologists, notably the late great James Henry Breasted, dug as brilliantly into the antique past. But none denied having built on the dramatic ruins uncovered over 62 years by Sir Flinders Petrie."

J. T. M.

Remarks on Music in Our Church Services

The summer of 1941 at Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Ill., Dr. Edward Rechlin, known in our circles as one of the foremost interpreters of Bach now living, delivered a lecture (the joint product of himself and his daughter, Miss Henrietta Rechlin) which was enthusiastically received by his audience and from which a paragraph is here submitted.

"True as it is that there is a fraction of the expression of any Christian faith which is common to all Christians, yet we know that Protestantism has, in that it expresses a world philosophy different from the Catholic, an essentially different culture. The individual Protestant is himself one of the royal priesthood; he stands alone with his saving faith, without intermediaries to shield him, without vestments and incense to opiate him into forgetting his personal responsibility. His religion is not only part of life and the whole duty of only his priest; it is his whole life, and the expression of his faith is then the statement in musical language not of the temporary, the artificially produced moment of elation, but of his oneness with God throughout every day of all his life. His music is individual and much more all-inclusive of life than is that of the Catholic Christian, and the most important form in which it has appeared in history is the hymn of supplication and praise. Deserted though the Protestant may be by all on earth, even by his Church, yet the symphony of the hymn remains to him to declare his immediate contact with his God. If this hymn represents the deepest expression of faith, it should also be the basis for communal musical worship, which is, after all, the gathering together of two or three, each of whom has the desire to sing to the Lord his praise, his own needs, and the needs of his fellow men. We realize at once that the Lutheran *chorale* fulfills the requirements for such worship. That it has been replaced to a large extent by expressions of later types of Protestantism is due not to any fault in the *chorale*, but rather to the changed philosophy which has permeated Protestant bodies during the years following the Reformation. We need only think back to the Rationalistic Movement which, sweeping the Protestant world from the year in which Johann Sebastian Bach died and taking with it even his great son Karl Philipp Emmanuel, weakened the might of the all-conquering faith which had effected the Reformation.

Since the musical part of our church services is often not given the importance that rightfully belongs to it and since in this sphere our Church possesses treasures which are viewed with warmest admiration by all great musicians, we ask our readers to ponder carefully the thoughts here submitted.

A.

On the Book of Mormon

The Book of Mormon was immediately questioned upon its first publication, according to a series of articles now running in *The United Presbyterian*. The pertinent passage in one of the articles runs as follows:

When Joseph Smith's book was published, it was immediately challenged as a manuscript which had been stolen from the home of the widow of the Rev. Solomon Spaulding, a Presbyterian minister, residing in Ontario, N. Y. Mrs. Spaulding swore that her husband had written it as a work of fiction to meet the deep interest created by the recent discovery of the ancient ruins in Central America, Mexico, the Cliff Dwellers and Mound Builders (of Ohio).

She said that her husband prepared two copies. One was sent to Mr. Patterson, a bookseller and printer of Pittsburgh, Pa., asking its publication. Mr. Patterson and Mr. Spaulding both died soon after, and the manuscript was not returned. The other manuscript mysteriously disappeared from her trunk when Joseph Smith, in his early years, was digging a well for her next-door neighbor. She, a brother of her husband, Mr. Redick McKee, who had lived in the Spaulding home, Mr. Joseph Miller of Washington County, Pa., and others who had frequently heard Mr. Spaulding read the manuscript, made affidavit that they were well acquainted with the Spaulding manuscript and knew positively that it, with numerous interpolations and omissions, inserted after it was stolen, was the Book of Mormon.

Another curious bit of history helped to confirm this. While Smith and his fellow workmen were digging the well mentioned above, they unearthed a beautiful white stone, almost transparent. It was given to the employers' children. It also disappeared at the same time with the manuscript, and these persons identified it as the "Urim and Thummim" used by Smith to interpret the golden leaves.

Another interesting fact is that some years ago President Fairchild of Oberlin College, while delving among old volumes in the college library, found the copy of the manuscript which had been given to Mr. Patterson of Pittsburgh and lost. This manuscript was the same as the Book of Mormon without the omissions and interpolations mentioned above. It would be hard to find a case more clearly proved. This, however, is all declared by Mormon leaders to be false and is unknown to the masses of Mormons.

The Presbyterian

An Attack on the Reliability of the Scriptures

As a review in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* shows, Dr. Millar Burrows of the American School of Oriental Research in a recent book entitled "What Mean These Stones?" makes the statement that at least in two points archaeology contradicts the statements of the Bible. The reviewer says, "One of these is the case of Darius the Mede (Dan. 5:31; 9:1; 11:1), who is said to have conquered Babylon. This personage has not been discovered by archaeological research, which on the contrary clearly seems to prove that the conquest was carried out by Cyrus the Persian. No one familiar with the facts can deny that there is an apparent contradiction. However, on the same page (277) Dr. Burrows recounts the

solution which archaeology has already brought to what seemed to be an equally obvious contradiction, in the case of another personage from the same book of Daniel, namely, Belshazzar. It seemed impossible that there could be any king of Babylon named Belshazzar, since scholars possessed a complete list of the later kings of Babylon, no Belshazzar appearing among them. The solution, when found, was simple. Belshazzar was reigning as a co-king with his father, who was in Arabia. It would be foolish to try to suggest a solution to the problem of Darius the Mede when so many scholars have already worked on it. But in view of the very numerous vindications of the Bible in similar circumstances, many of which vindications our author relates, it would seem the part of prudence to name the case of Darius a *seeming* contradiction while awaiting further light on the question, which we may confidently expect will eventually come. — The other contradiction named by Dr. Burrows is the case of the Philistines mentioned in Genesis 26. All the indications of archaeology are to the effect that the Philistines first invaded Palestine about 1200 B. C., so that the conclusion would seem to be that either the Bible is wrong or else archaeology has erred. No archaeologists would accept the latter conclusion when the evidence is so strong. However, if eminent scientists in this field are willing to postulate two invasions of Palestine by the Hebrews, more than a century apart, on the basis of archaeological findings, would it not be just as logical to assume two invasions by the Philistines, the first one of which would be timed to fit the conditions of Genesis 26? It need not have been a very large invasion to meet Biblical requirements, and hence what traces it had left could easily have escaped the excavators thus far. This is just one hypothesis, which may not be correct, but it would be more prudent to denominate this case also a *seeming* contradiction, and to await further information on this matter likewise."

We submit the above because our pastors and other teachers of religion in our Church should be informed on attacks made on the inerrancy of the Scriptures. At the same time the two instances mentioned demonstrate how little the Bible has to fear from a truly impartial, objective study of historical facts.

W. ARNDT

The Federal Council and Its Antecedents

While we condemn the unionistic principles on which the Federal Council of Churches is founded, our readers ought to be acquainted with its character and its methods of work. From the *Lutheran* we reprint the following sketch of its historical background and its various organizational features, written by Dr. Charles Schaeffer of the Evangelical and Reformed Church:

"The first ecumenical movement in America occurred just 200 years ago, in 1742, under Zinzendorf — when he sought to bring the Protestant bodies among the German-speaking people of Pennsylvania into one body known as "The Congregation of God in Spirit." This movement, however, failed, for reasons which need not now be enumerated. But the urge for united action on the part of religious bodies persisted. The Reformed Churches of the Netherlands a few years later raised the in-

quiry as to the possibility of effecting a union between the Presbyterians, the Dutch Reformed, and the German Reformed Church as in Pennsylvania. But this plan was likewise blocked. The missionary impulse, to care for the spiritual life of frontier settlements, led the churches of New England and the Middle Colonies to organize societies of a missionary character which disclaimed any sectarian objective.

"These societies multiplied rapidly. The avowed purpose was to create a non-sectarian agency or agencies under which all benevolently disposed persons could co-operate. Some of these societies were named after the States, but there were others of a variety of names, like Cent Societies, Female Missionary Societies, Young People's Societies, Youth's Missionary Societies, Children's Cent Societies, etc. Then came the American Tract Society and the American Bible Society and the American Sunday School Union, formed in 1824.

"At the opening of the century in 1801 the Plan of Union was formed by the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists. Out of this developed the American Home Missionary Society in 1826, in which Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and others joined to establish churches in unchurched sections of the country. Then came the Evangelical Alliance for the United States, as the American branch of the Evangelical Alliance of England in 1846. The American branch was organized in 1867. The Young Men's Christian Association followed in 1851 and the Young Women's Christian Association in 1858. The Women's Christian Temperance Union, representing women of all denominations, and the Young People's Society Christian Endeavor in 1883, the Students' Volunteer Movement in 1886, and the Laymen's Missionary Movement, organized in 1906. All these cut across denominational lines and pioneered in the field of co-operative effort.

Then came the Federal Council, the preliminary meeting of which was held in 1905 and the formal organization in 1908. The Foreign Missions Conference had already been founded in 1892. The Home Missions Council was organized in March, 1908, and the Council of Women for Home Missions in the fall of the same year. State and local interdenominational organizations were formed at a comparatively early date. The development of the spirit of co-operation shows itself in the fact that since the opening of the present century an indefinitely large number of local interdenominational organizations have been formed for the purpose of doing work unitedly. More than 1,300 such organizations are known to exist. This includes ministerial associations and similar groups.

"Apart from State, City, or Local Councils, there emerged a number of Interdenominational Agencies with a view of co-ordinating and integrating specific types of work. The following eight were definitely organized with offices and staffs, with a total operating budget of \$780,000 annually. They are: The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the International Council of Religious Education, the Home Missions' Council of North America, the Foreign Missions' Conference of North America, the Council of Church Boards of Education, the National Council of Church Women, the United Stewardship Council of

the United States and Canada, the Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada.

"For some time in the past the leaders in these various organizations were aware of overlapping at many points and at times of working at cross-purposes. Consequently, the question presented itself, whether the time had not come to unite the union agencies into something that would give the impression of and express the closer solidarity of the same. Consequently in 1940 a committee was appointed representing the first six of these agencies to make a preliminary study of the possibility of forming closer relations among these agencies." A.

"Αγαι, Luke 24:21

Exegetes are in disagreement on the precise interpretation of the way in which Luke employs the verb *ἀγαι* in the passage mentioned. As to the general meaning of the passage there is no difficulty. The A.V. rendering "today is the third day since these things were done" quite satisfactorily expresses the sense. What interpreters are not agreed on is the question whether *ἀγαι* is a personal verb or whether it must be considered an impersonal one. Plummer in his *Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* thus describes the view of exegetical writers: "The verb is probably impersonal, 'one is keeping the third day, we are at the third day' (Grotius, Bengel, De Wette, Noesgen, Wordsworth, Hahn). Perhaps we may understand *ὁ Ἰησοῦς* (Meyer, Godet, Weiss, Alford): the speaker has an impression that there was a predication about the third day. But it is not probable that either *ὁ ἥλιος*, or *ὁ οὐρανός*, or *χρόνος*, or *Ἰσραήλ* is to be supplied. Compare *περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ* (1 Pet. 2:6)." Blass-Debrunner, one of the best modern grammars, takes the view that *ἀγαι* is impersonal (par. 129). It seems to me that the question is decided in favor of the personal construction by a sentence in the famous quotation found in the *Antiquities of Josephus* (XVIII, 3, 3) with reference to Christ. Whether these words are genuine or not we need not now investigate. They at any rate are evidence as to Greek usage. Having stated that even after Christ's death his followers clung to him, the passage continues, *ἐφάνη γὰρ αὐτοῖς τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν πάλιν ζῶν*, "for he appeared to them on the third day being alive again." The phrase *τρίτην ἔχων ἡμέραν* can hardly be translated literally. It seems to be a perfect counterpart of *τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἀγαι*. That the Josephus passage has the personal construction in the phrase submitted is clear. Hence I think that the passage in Luke 24:21 must be viewed the same way. The subject of *ἀγαι* is Jesus. We have no idiom in our language which resembles the Greek one and hence have to translate like the King James Version.

W. ARNDT



Theological Observer

Louisville Convention of the U. L. C. A.—At this convention, which met in October, important business was transacted. One ought not to overlook that in connection with it the two hundredth anniversary of the arrival of Henry Melchior Muehlenberg was celebrated. A centennial which was given recognition was that of the departure of Father Heyer for India, which meant that he became the first missionary of the Lutheran Church in America to India. The convention was particularly important because it was confronted with the question whether the invitation of the Federal Council of Churches to accept full membership in its midst should be acted on favorably. As we reported last time, the convention voted negatively on this question. It must not be overlooked, however, that the U. L. C. A. voted to increase its membership on Council committees from two to fourteen and to contribute annually \$4,000 instead of \$2,000 as in the past. Hence the U. L. C. A. by no means showed a tendency to cancel its present relations with the Federal Council of Churches. That it did not accept the invitation for full membership was largely due to the wish of the delegates not to take any action which would hinder the consummation of union with other Lutheran bodies. President F. H. Knubel, it is true, voiced a note of warning when he spoke against "dangerous entanglements" and of being "shackled" to the Federal Council. There were other men, one is glad to note, who pointed to the doctrinal issue involved. Thus, the secretary, Dr. W. H. Greever, "raised doubt concerning the orthodoxy of the Federal Council." According to the reporter in the *Christian Century* Dr. E. P. Pfatteicher asserted that the Federal Council "had overstressed comity and had laid the basis of totalitarianism in its emphasis on the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man." When Dr. Em. Poppen came as the representative of the American Lutheran Church and stated that his church body was willing to establish church fellowship with the U. L. C. A. on the wholehearted and full acceptance of, and adherence to, the Pittsburgh Agreement, he was greeted with much applause, and it was resolved that the presidents of the two bodies should take action to bring about the consummation of this union. May the conservatives in the A. L. C. be granted grace to adhere manfully to their convictions! A.

More Mergers Planned.—According to the *Christian Century* of October 28 the Evangelical Church decided in its meeting held in October, 1942, to approve a plan of union with the United Brethren in Christ. The United Brethren are expected to take similar action at their next quadrennial conference in 1945. The Evangelical Church (not to be confused with the Evangelical Synod) was organized by Albrecht, a former Lutheran who accepted Methodistic principles and practices in the latter part of the eighteenth century. They were formerly known as Albrechts-Brueder and were known for their emotionalism and pietism. The United Brethren are really of German Reformed extraction and were organized under Otterbein and Boehm about 1760. Both church

bodies are Methodistic in doctrine and tried to affiliate with the Methodist Church around 1800. Because of the language question they were compelled to effect separate organizations. It seems but natural that these two groups would now unite, since their racial, historic, and religious antecedents are so much alike. It is not unlikely that they may ultimately join with the Methodist Church, a merger of the Northern and the Southern Methodist Episcopal Churches and the Protestant Methodist Church.

The Evangelical Synod has also been active in effecting a merger. In 1934 the Evangelical and Reformed Churches consummated a merger which brought together the Evangelical Synod, a fusion of Reformed and Lutheran elements, and the Reformed Church in the United States, formerly known as the German Reformed Church. The doctrinal position of both the Evangelical Synod and the Reformed Church is Reformed as defined in the Heidelberg Catechism. True, the Evangelical Synod formerly accepted the Lutheran Confessions and the Heidelberg Catechism in so far as they agreed, but the predominant theology in this merged church body is Reformed and definitely unionistic. It seemed but natural that these two bodies effected a merger. But we are somewhat surprised that this Evangelical and Reformed merger would now pass a resolution to bring about a merger with the Congregational and Christian Churches. The Congregational Church, as is well known, has been very liberal, because its basic principle is that no ecclesiastical organization may in any way determine creeds for the local congregation. Each congregation is autonomous and responsible to no one for its doctrinal platform. The Christian Church, with which the Congregational Church has united, is one of the groups which grew out of the Great Revival at the beginning of the last century and which was opposed to all denominational names and creeds. It seems, then, that these four churches are related in so far as they are all more or less indifferent over against a doctrinal position.

It is difficult to foretell what will happen to the Evangelical and Reformed Church doctrinally if and when the merger with the Congregational and Christian Churches is effected. It seems that the only point on which they really are all agreed is their indifference over against doctrine, in other words, their unionistic principle.

The only point that seems to be causing some difficulty in effecting a merger is the question of financial obligations of the various groups, particularly the ministerial pension. No doubt, the proposed merger of the United Brethren and the Evangelical Church as well as the larger merger of the Evangelical and Reformed Churches with the Congregational and Christian Churches will be effected if satisfactory arrangements can be made regarding the financial obligations of each group.

F. E. M.

As Seen by a Convert to Catholicism.—In our *Sunday Visitor* of September 6 a person who formerly belonged to the Lutheran Church and now has become a Romanist mentions the reasons why Lutherans should be favorable to the Roman Catholic Church. He dwells on the conservative Reformation which Luther inaugurated as distinct from

that of Zwingli and Calvin, which tended to sweep aside everything that reminded one of Romanism, and in this conservative character he finds arguments for the position that Lutherans should be willing to turn Catholic. In this connection he dwells on the aloofness of Lutherans, especially of the Missouri Synod, when relations to other Christian bodies come into consideration. He states, "As has already been pointed out, the Lutheran is a distinctly doctrinal Church—a fact which is a help as well as a hindrance to conversion. The average non-Catholic is accustomed to say that 'one Church is as good as another.' To him the doctrinal strictness and the aloofness of the Catholic Church seems very hard to understand, not to say positively un-Christian, but the Lutheran would have no difficulty here, for most of them stand more or less aloof from other denominations. In fact, the powerful Missouri Synod is even stricter than the Church [that is, the Roman Catholic Church. A.]. A Missouri pastor is not allowed to take part in any assembly, even of a civic or patriotic nature, where prayer is offered. They will not permit any '*communio in sacris*' even with other Lutherans. And most of the others hold to the view 'Lutheran altars for Lutheran communicants, Lutheran pulpits for Lutheran ministers.'"

We are glad to see that this person acknowledges that the Lutheran Church is a doctrinal Church. Whether he really understands why Lutherans practice aloofness we doubt. Does he realize that according to Lutheran teaching there are children of God in all denominations where the means of grace are still in use? Does he know that this aloofness is due to the conviction that a person cannot be for and against a divine truth at the same time and that in the Holy Scriptures there is contained the warning that a little leaven will leaven the whole lump? What he says about the Missouri Synod's aloofness must be taken with a grain of salt. It is here where his language is not definite enough. If he were to prove that a Missouri pastor is "not allowed to take part in any assembly, even of a civic or patriotic nature, where prayer is offered," he would face a difficult task. But as far as he ascribes strictness to us, we gladly accept the compliment. A.

Successor of Christ or Antichrist.—In Rev. F. C. Streufert's *Report on the Survey of the South American Missions*, published in the *Minutes of the Fiscal Conference* (Aug. 4–6, 1942, River Forest) there are two paragraphs which we wish to present to our readers for special study. The first pertains to the educational program of the Roman Catholic Church. Pastor Streufert writes: "Not until we are active in the education of children the Catholic Church, as a rule, gets busy, and then it tries to offset our efforts. It will erect a much larger and better-equipped school than we have. Forty per cent of Brazil's population is illiterate, and for sixty per cent of Brazil's children there are no schools." What a contrast between Roman Catholic educational work there and here! Rome becomes active in educational work only under pressure of Protestant competition.

The other paragraph touches on the important question of Antichrist. We read: "In their Catechism the Catholic Church openly states that they need not fear the Protestant churches, since, as a whole, they have

long ago forsaken the doctrines of the Reformation. *But they point to the Missouri Synod as the one church to be feared, since Missouri Synod Lutherans still cling to the teachings of Luther.* [Italics our own.] In another article Catholic writers state that the Missouri Lutherans are the only people that still believe and teach that the Pope is the Antichrist. With a sigh, as it were, they add: *'They are logical indeed! For if the Pope is not the successor of Christ, he must be the Antichrist.'* [Italics our own.] Here is a conclusion worth pondering. J. T. M.

Amillennialism.—The *Calvin Forum* (August-September, 1942) offers the following noteworthy editorial on Premillennialism. We read: "Many sincere Christian people believe that our Lord will sit upon an earthly throne in Palestine to rule on this sinful earth for a period of one thousand years when He returns at the time of His second coming. The great historic stream of Christian Bible study, preaching, and theology has never accepted this view, though there have always been individuals and smaller groups who did. In recent decades this view has been propagated widely and enthusiastically not only by certain sects, but also by leaders in a large sector of the conservative wing of the larger historic denominations. It is our firm belief that the Dispensationalism rampant in our day is but the consistent application of this unbiblical view of an earthly thousand year reign of Christ in Palestine. Possibly this Dispensationalist development of recent Millennialism in American conservative circles may serve to clarify the issue that is at stake on this score. That issue has surely not been clarified by the introduction of the triplet of terms: Premillennialism, Postmillennialism and Amillennialism. These three terms are not objective designations of three co-ordinate views on the question of a millennium. These terms, coined by those who hold to an earthly thousand year reign of Christ (though later often taken over by their opponents) are freighted with the prejudices of that viewpoint. This also accounts for the fact that two or three decades ago one only heard of the alternative 'Pre' and 'Post' when the issue was argued or defined. It also accounts for the peculiar fact that some 'Pre's' speak of Amillennialism as a recent novelty, whereas the view which that term designates is as old as Scripture and the beginnings of Christian theology. It is not only that, but it is also the prevailing view of the Reformed Theology. This is indirectly granted by those Premillennialist writers who speak of the age of the great Reformers as the period in which the real light on the word of God had not yet dawned. The use of the term Amillennialism may serve to clarify the real issue, provided it is not co-ordinated with the other two terms. The real issue is not a 'Pre' and 'Post' issue. The real issue is whether there will be a millennium in the sense of a physical, literal, earthly thousand year reign of Christ on this sinful earth with Palestine as its center. In other words, it is Millennialism (Millenarianism, as the older term went) versus Amillennialism. The Millennial literature is quite profuse, easily accessible, and freely distributed. The Amillennial or historically Christian position has repeatedly in recent decades been placed in a false light by certain Fundamentalist writers. The need for fair, objective, and dispassionate

study of this subject is exhibited by the disappointing way in which Dr. J. Oliver Buswell writes on the subject in the May 2, 1942, issue of *The Sunday School Times*, apparently attempting to refute the articles of Dr. Pieters, which appeared on the subject in our columns a few years ago. For reading on this subject we would call attention to the fine series of fifteen articles under the general title *Amillennialism in the New Testament* from the pen of Dr. Robert Strong, which have been running from January to August in *The Presbyterian Guardian*. This series ought to be preserved in more permanent form and placed on the market." We may add that also Rev. Floyd E. Hamilton's recent book *The Basis of Millennial Faith*, published by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., will prove helpful to our pastors in their witness against Premillennialism. It contains a number of statements with which the reviewer could not agree, but on the whole its arguments against Premillennialism are unanswerable. J. T. M.

Religious Conditions in Germany.—On account of the present war it is difficult to obtain authentic information on religious affairs in Germany. In the *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* for October, 1942, a speech of Dr. Wurm, Bishop of Wuertemberg, is quoted as it had appeared in *Schweizer Evangelischer Pressedienst*. The address was made as long ago as September 2, 1941. Dr. Wurm complains bitterly of interference on the part of the State with matters belonging to the sphere of the authority of the Church. He mentions the alarming degree to which religious instruction is done away with. According to his statement the Church in Wuertemberg was deprived of its four lower seminaries. While in other countries, as he points out, in times of war the attempt is made to preserve peace between the various groups of the population, in Germany apparently the very opposite is striven for. The Church more and more has been forced to abandon its work. At the beginning of the war religious instruction was with one stroke eliminated in the upper classes of the secondary schools (*Oberschulen*). The providing of Christian literature for the soldiers was forbidden after it had gotten a good start. The Christian papers were suppressed. The request of church authorities to permit at least a little printing for the sake of the sick and the old people who could not attend church services was not granted. Inner mission work in hospitals was made difficult, and baptisms in the female clinics were forbidden. Prayer in school was abrogated. Dr. Wurm asks whether the Government really thinks that it can help the achievement of victory by offending the 95 per cent of the population which still claims to be Christian.

The same article in the *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* culls important information from the *Basler Nachrichten* of last spring. There it is reported that while the Storm Troopers ordinarily have no chaplains and always have considered it a matter of pride not to whimper in the face of danger and difficulties, the almost unbearable deprivations and sufferings of the Russian campaign last winter made many of them desire to have the services of a chaplain, and they sent requests to other divisions that were provided with spiritual advisers for help in their indescribable anguish and peril. To us it seems that the Nietzschean

philosophy which has been ruling the German leaders has almost run its course and will soon be abandoned. Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, General Secretary of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, has just returned from Switzerland, and he points out, according to the daily press, that throughout Germany there is much dissatisfaction with the Nazis. Quite interesting, too, and significant is the information contained in the following sentence: "Reports reaching London said that last May 6,687 ministers of the German Evangelical Church out of a total of 18,047 were at the front; up to last April 689 ministers, assistant ministers, and theological students were in action." A.

Honorary Divinity Doctorates.— Under this heading the *Calvin Forum* (November, 1942) offers an editorial which confirms the present-day tendency among reputable schools and in learned circles of our country to discourage the conferring of honorary divinity doctorates upon men in the liberal and often unreasonable manner in which this has been done in the past. The editorial reads: "Recently Hope College, of the Reformed Church in America, located at Holland, Michigan, dedicated its new quarter million dollar science building. We rejoice with the friends of Hope in this new acquisition to their academic facilities and trust the commodious and beautiful structure, with its fine Dutch architectural design, will prove a real asset to the college founded by Western Michigan's great Dutch pioneer Van Raalte. The dedication of the new building was celebrated in a dignified service held in the beautiful Hope Memorial Chapel. In connection with this dedication the papers report that 'honorary degrees were conferred on three of Hope's alumni who did outstanding work in the campaign which raised \$250,000 for construction of the edifice.' The names of the three men so honored are then given, together with the information that one of them received a doctorate of letters and the other two a doctorate of divinity. We cannot suppress the question what may be the connection between the raising of funds for a college building and becoming a doctor of divinity—or of letters for that matter. We wish in no way to underestimate the fine services which these three alumni have undoubtedly given unselfishly to their Alma Mater. They undoubtedly deserve recognition for these unusual labors. Much less would we begrudge them any honor that someone may wish to award them. As it chances, each one of the three is an acquaintance and personal friend of the writer, and he holds them in the highest esteem for their abilities and achievements. But why should doctor of divinity degrees be passed out as bouquets of 'thank you' for financial services rendered to an educational institution? We know there are inferior schools in this country which indulge in this hawking of degrees, but we cannot think of Hope College with its fine academic standing and reputation as wanting to be placed in that category. We know that schools of no standing in this country have greatly cheapened the doctor of divinity degree both in its honorary and in its 'earned' form. But we refuse to believe that so fine a school as Hope College belongs to this class of institutions and would have part in making the fair name of doctor of divinity a mockery in this fashion. It would be a credit to a school of the standing of Hope College if it

would discontinue this practice and give a degree either when it has been academically earned or, in honorary form, when the recipient so honored has achieved unusual distinction in the field of scholarship in which the degree is awarded." Let pastors bear in mind that there is no more honored, no more worthy, and no more fitting title than that which is conferred upon them by their calling—the Biblical and ecclesiastical title of *pastor*, which stands for far more than any doctor's title can ever stand.

J. T. M.

Princeton Theological Seminary.—The writer of this article has read the *Calvin Forum* for a number of years and regards it as a trustworthy periodical, its articles being characterized by fundamentalist orthodoxy, soberness, and moderation in judgment. He is therefore all the more willing to publish the following editorial (though he is not personally able to vouch for Princeton's orthodoxy), in which the *Forum* (cf. November issue, 1942) denies the widely spread opinion in conservative circles that Princeton Seminary has become Barthian and liberal in its theology. The editorial says: "There was a time, only a few years ago, when it seemed that Princeton Theological Seminary was to become the American center for the incubation and propagation of the Dialectic Theology. The President of this distinguished institution brought Emil Brunner to this country and offered him a visiting professorship in the famous chair of Systematic Theology formerly occupied by Charles Hodge and Benjamin Warfield. But Brunner's stay was short-lived. Since that time it appears that the popularity of 'Barthianism' is definitely on the wane in Princeton. Dr. Kuizenga, who for the last two years has occupied the chair which Brunner held for a year, is definitely anti-Barthian in his theological position. The lectures which he recently delivered at the Institute of Theology in Princeton and at a Reformed Ministers' Conference in Western Michigan are in the finest tradition of the Reformed Faith. It may not be an easy matter to classify each member of the present Princeton Seminary faculty theologically, but one may be sure that it is quite misleading to brand the theological position taught at Princeton today as simply Barthian or as Modernist." We offer this quotation to our readers for careful consideration, since Christian love demands absolute fairness also when dealing with persons who are on the other side of the theological fence.

J. T. M.

Thoughts for Reformation Sunday.—In view of the fact that Reformation Day no longer has that significance in many Lutheran circles which it formerly had, it may be worth considering what *The Sunday School Times* (Oct. 10, 1942) has to say on this subject. The *Times* is an interdenominational periodical and must therefore exercise caution in making suggestions, since its readers are given to different kinds of attitudes and prejudices. But the *Times*, nevertheless, champions a *Reformation Sunday* in our American churches, and rightly so. It says: "Reformation Sunday is widely celebrated on the Continent of Europe. This is natural. Christians on the Continent are everywhere under the shadow of Romanism, now denser, now less dense, but always threatening. In Spain the spirit of persecution is approaching a new maximum. In France the Catholic reaction controls the Vichy Government. In

Austria and Belgium it is much the same. Protestants need to encourage themselves with the thought of the heroic past of Protestantism and God's past deliverances. They must train their children against the spirit of compromise. They must give them Passover instruction concerning the escape from a darker Egypt than that of the Jews. So they gather in German marketplaces to sing the 'Mighty Fortress' chorale of Luther. In Stockholm men's choirs assemble outside the old brick Ridderholm Church, in which Gustavus Adolphus' bones lie, and pour forth in mighty volume: 'Fear not, O little flock, the foe Who madly seeks your overthrow.' Gathered in French and Swiss chapels, the men of the Reformed Church chant the solemn chorales of the Reformation composer Clement Marot. At times young French Protestant women make pilgrimages to the Tour de Constance, where unyielding French Protestant heroines passed decades ago in weary prison confinement rather than to bow the knee to Rome and attend the single mass which would have meant their release. In New York is the grave of Elie Naou on the north side of Trinity Churchyard, within a hundred feet of Broadway. Few men in the Reformation endured so long and so heroically dungeon and hunger and chains as he. Indeed, one might wish that instead of the various special Sundays which have been imposed on reluctant Christians in America, we, too, might have a Reformation Sunday in October. Such a Sunday would suitably harmonize with the high days of the Christian Year." The *Times* then offers "some thoughts for Reformation Sunday (celebrated last year on October 31) from the pen of the gifted French pastor Paul Gounelle and published in the organ of French Protestantism *Le Christianisme au XXIème Siècle*." It is the story of Huguenot faithfulness for over a hundred years despite Romish persecution so dreadful that it almost beggars description. While Lutherans now arise to deny that the Pope is the Antichrist, orthodox Reformed circles urge the time-old claim of both the Reformed and the Lutheran confessions that by its false doctrine and horrid persecution of those who believed and confessed the *sola fide* the Church of Rome has proved itself the Church of Antichrist.

J. T. M.

The American Sunday-School Union. — The American Sunday-School Union last year celebrated its 125th anniversary, as *The Sunday School Times* (Nov. 14, 1942) reports. It began as the Sunday and Adult School Union, started in May, 1817, in Philadelphia "for the establishment of schools giving gratis instruction on the Sabbath." Its growth was immediate and remarkable. By 1831 about 70,000 teachers and 700,000 pupils had come into its membership, and this despite the fact that it never received the general approval of the churches and that even an attempt was made to prevent it from getting a charter from the Pennsylvania legislature. It was distinctly a laymen's movement. For a hundred years previously John Cotton's New England Primer, with questions and answers, had been the standard source of Christian training for children. The Sunday-School Union emphasized Bible study and not catechetical work. In the early days it was necessary to teach reading in most of the Sunday schools, and the reading book was the Bible. Memorization of Scripture passages has always had an im-

portant place in its scheme of instruction. Among the champions of the American Sunday-School Union were such men as Daniel Webster, Frederick Theodore Frelinghuysen, Attorney General Wirt, and Francis Scott Key. Mr. Justice McLean and Mr. Justice Strong of the Supreme Court were at one time presidents of the organization. In 1941 the association maintained 3,500 Sunday schools in 40 States, with over 144,000 in attendance. More than 400 new schools were established. J. T. M.

The Christian Education of our American Youth.—In the *Watchman-Examiner* of October 29, 1942, Dr. Talmadge C. Johnson publishes an important article having the title "Education for Godlessness." The subtitle indicates the drift of the article, "Does Separation of Church and State Mean Separation of Christianity from the State?" The article is largely concerned with the material printed in a book by Dr. W. S. Fleming with the title "God in Our Public Schools." Discussing the contents of this book, Dr. Johnson writes, "Dr. Fleming charges that the secularized public school is destroying religion and wrecking the nation through crime. That is a terrible indictment. But if it be true that 'the schools make the nation,' it follows that they cannot escape the responsibility for the present decline in religion and the growth of crime which has certainly accompanied it. The American people have a capital investment of six billion dollars in their public schools and annually expend in operating them two and a half billion dollars. They have a right to judge them by results. Prominent educators from Horace Mann to Nicholas Murray Butler and Luther A. Weigle have said that without religious instruction in the schools the nation will become pagan. It is not necessary to teach paganism; it is sufficient to omit positive Christian teaching. The present state of the nation proves that they are not false prophets, but far-sighted statesmen. It is claimed that in order to preserve the separation of Church and State, religion cannot be taught in the State system of education. In my own previous article I pointed out that our Baptist forefathers, who perhaps did most to establish this doctrine in America, never called for a bifurcation of life nor advocated separation of Christianity and the State. Dean Weigle of the Yale Divinity School, in a forceful introduction to Dr. Fleming's book, takes the same position and says that the doctrine means just what the phrase implies—that Church and State are mutually free. And he adds: 'It means a separation of control, so that neither Church nor State will attempt to control the other. But it does not mean that the State acknowledges no God or that the State is exempt from the moral laws where-with God sets the bounds for nations as well as individuals. There is nothing in the status of the public school as an institution of the State, therefore, to render it godless.' Dr. Fleming shows positively that early public education was decidedly religious and that, as a matter of fact, religion was its dominant chord. Such textbooks as the *New England Primer*, *Murray's Grammar*, *McGuffey's Readers*, and others in general use devoted much space to religious and moral precepts. Religion was also prominent in the institutions of higher learning used by the State. It was not until 1870 that it began to leave the schools. The author maintains, and rightly so, that it was never legislated out of the schools

nor dropped by the will of the people; it was quietly crowded out by alien influence and indifference. Certainly it is now out, and we now have education for godlessness! But there are no constitutional or legal reasons why it should remain out."

The author rightly maintains that religious education cannot be given in homes that are irreligious. Looking at church schools, that is, Sunday schools, he finds that they are entirely inadequate. Unchurched children are not likely to go to church schools. The same difficulty obtains with respect to religious instruction given on released school time through the week. "Nor," says Dr. Johnson, "is it possible to teach morality without religion, as some are advocating." Having looked at all the possibilities that suggest themselves to him, he concludes that the only remedy lies in a return of the teaching of religion to the public schools. "To deny that the State has a right to do this is to deny it the sovereign right of preserving and protecting its own life."

Continuing his discussion of this point, Dr. Johnson thinks that we have an analogy in what the State is doing for its armed forces and for penal institutions by providing chaplains for them. "The right of the State to employ chaplains is not challenged," he says. "Why, then, should it be impossible for the State to introduce religious instruction in the public schools?" A vital point is touched on by him in the following words: "This is no plea for the teaching of any sectarian doctrine. Churches and parents may well teach whatever sectarian doctrines they may believe. But Christian doctrines ought to be taught all the youth of a Christian nation. And only the public schools reach all."

Nobody can fail to be touched by the words of Dr. Johnson. What he points to is a most deplorable situation, a crying need. America is rushing into paganism; no one who has eyes to see and ears to hear can deny this. But is the remedy to be sought in the introduction of religious instruction in the public schools? Does Dr. Johnson visualize the difficulties that are involved? He speaks of Christian instruction to be given to the children of the nation. But many of the parents of these children are not Christian; they are Jews or atheists or agnostics. What right has the State to foist instruction which they abhor on the children of such people? The analogy of the chaplains is not quite applicable, because no one in the armed forces or penal institutions of the Government is compelled to listen to or at any rate to accept the message of the chaplain and to use his ministrations. Another difficulty consists in the impossibility of teaching the Christian religion without bringing in denominational views. Dr. Johnson quite correctly says that morality cannot be taught effectively without religion, and he might go a step farther and say that religion cannot be taught effectively without reference to and emphasis on certain denominational views. As it appears to us, if the introduction of religious instruction in the public schools were attempted, before long in a majority of the classrooms lively religious debates would be conducted on a number of fundamental points of the Christian religion where the denominations clash. Why does Dr. Johnson not discuss at greater length the availability of private schools conducted by the various denominations, which schools would have to serve as a salt in the educational system?

A.

Your Income Tax and Benevolences.—*The Presbyterian Guardian* (Nov. 25, 1942) points out how Christians may take full advantage of the 15% allowed them this year on their income tax by contributing liberally toward the Church and her manifold needs. The underlying principle is this: "Income tax is calculated upon net income, that is, gross income after such items as business expenses, deductible taxes, losses from sale of securities, bad debts, and the like, are deducted. If you give up to 15% of this net income, not to individuals but to *bona fide* benevolent organizations, the amount you give may be deducted from your net income and is not subject to tax. A few examples are added to show how this principle works out for various income brackets. We quote the following two. Take a married couple with two children and a net income of \$3,124. If they give 15% (\$468.60) to benevolences, they may subtract this much from their taxable income. Their taxable income will thus be \$2,655.40. They may also take a credit of 10% (\$265.54) for earned net income which is not subject to the normal tax, but is subject to the surtax. They may also take credit for \$1900—\$1200 for themselves and \$350 for each child. This will leave them a total tax of \$127.59. If they had not given the \$468.60 to benevolences, their total tax would have been \$213.82. It will thus cost them only \$382.37 to give \$468.60 to benevolences or about 82% for every dollar they contribute, while the agencies to which they contribute receive the full amount of \$468.60.—Or take the example of a married couple with one child and a net income of \$4,200. They have already given \$280 to their local church and to missions. Their total tax would be \$437.88. If they were to give an additional \$350 to benevolences before December 31, 1942, their total tax would be \$362.98. They could thus give \$350 at a net cost to themselves of only \$275.10 or about 78% on the dollar." The writer adds: "These examples are not presented to display how legitimate income taxes may be avoided. The Government has wisely provided for deduction of 15% for benevolences, and this provision was made with the deliberate purpose of inducing individuals to make contributions to *bona fide* benevolent organizations. By taking advantage of this very legitimate deduction, you are enabled to assist your favorite benevolent cause even in these times of high income taxes. By taking advantage of this deduction, you may assist in the spread of the Gospel to a measure which possibly you could not afford if it were not for the deduction allowances. Of course, if you feel that you cannot afford to give as much as 15% of your net income, even with the liberal deduction which this would provide, you may make proportionate deductions from your income tax for smaller amounts which you contribute." Isn't the suggestion worth considering? The Church certainly needs the contributions which our Government so generously allows church members to deduct from their income tax.

J. T. M.

Brief Item.—At this writing there are 19 vacant congregations in 16 parishes in our District. Most of these are calling at this time. Calling congregations are urged to give also serious consideration to the matter of adequate salary for their men.

Southern Nebraska District Messenger

Book Review

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

The Basis of Millennial Faith. By Floyd E. Hamilton. Wm. E. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. 160 pages, 5½ × 7¾. \$1.00.

The writer of this book was a premillennialist who was led to see that a millennialism as defended especially by Dr. Machen avoids all difficulties connected with both premillennialism and postmillennialism. The results of his studies on the subject are offered in this timely book, which is to prove that premillennialism is in every way unscriptural. Of special interest the reviewer has found the chapters "Must We Interpret Old Testament Prophecies Literally," "The 'Rod of Iron' Rule by Christ," and "Does Revelation Chapter 20 Teach an Earthly Millennium?" This, however, does not mean that the other chapters are not worth studying. But let the reader peruse the book with care, for it contains many viewpoints and statements that are not in agreement with our Lutheran Confessions. The author, for example, places the coming of Antichrist just before the battle of Armageddon at the end of the world. (P. 36.) Of the Jews he says that when they see Christ returning for the Last Judgment, they will "look on Him whom they pierced and repent and believe in Him instantaneously as their Messiah." (*Ibid.*) When he writes: "Whether the period following the resurrection is the eternal kingdom of God or a thousand-year millennium may be open to question" (p. 50), he practically tears down all that he has tried to build up by his whole line of argument. Nevertheless, there is so much that is valuable in his studies, and his fundamental arguments against premillennialism are so altogether well founded that we recommend this new treatise on the subject of Chiliasm.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

This Freedom — Whence? By J. Wesley Bready. Published by the American Tract Society, New York. 365 pages. \$1.50. 1942. Illustrated. Indexed.

This volume is an abridgement and a revision of Dr. Bready's recent and fully-documented book *England: Before and After Wesley*. The author tells us: "That work already has been run through five large English editions and was chosen 'Religious Book of the Month' in England. The volume has been slightly condensed and in parts rewritten in the light of the fast-moving drama of contemporary events. However, nothing has been omitted which is essential to an intelligent understanding of the greatest moral, spiritual, and social epic the modern world has known." The author received his theological training in the United States and held several important pastorates both here and in Canada. He gave more than seventeen years of painstaking research to this monumental work. It was possible for him to spend five years of research in England through the creation of a special Religious Historical Research Trust Fund supported by two prime ministers, two

university chancellors, two university presidents, as well as several senators and cabinet ministers, and many others from all walks of life. In our opinion this Fund's investment in Dr. Bready has brought rich fruitage. His work is the best and most comprehensive study of John Wesley and the Methodist movement that has ever come into our hands. We only wish that as great an interest in such historical and theological research work might be found in our own circles, so that we might have a fund of this kind which would enable our own men to do exhaustive research work in the field of church history, archaeology, and other theological branches. As it is, certain work that should be done remains undone because the money is lacking to make the necessary research at home and abroad possible. The history of the Lutheran Church in America in general and the history of our own Synod in particular will never be properly studied and adequately presented until we can make the means available to the student and free him from other arduous duties, so that he can devote all his time and effort over a period of years to this work.

Dr. Bready's thesis is to show that the social, moral, and material development of our era, our whole scheme of democratic freedom stems from the great eighteenth century spiritual awakening inaugurated by John Wesley. He tells us how he was prompted to develop this thesis:

"My historical interest in the wider impacts of the Evangelical Revival developed indirectly. The years of research behind my book *Lord Shaftesbury and Social-Industrial Progress* forced upon me the conviction that never can the achievements of that inimitable reformer be understood or appraised apart from the mighty Evangelical Movement that inspired his 'humanity.' My later study in child welfare, *Dr. Barnardo: Physician, Pioneer, Prophet*, confirmed and deepened this conviction; for Shaftesbury and Barnardo are but representative of a glorious succession of reformers who, inspired by a common faith, enriched beyond measure the entire social heritage of the English-speaking peoples. Hence my interest in the present subject."

There are three general divisions to the thesis: 1. A close analysis of the social, political, economic, and religious conditions preceding this spiritual awakening. 2. A survey of the origin, development, and impact of the Evangelical Movement. 3. An examination of the unparalleled, practical fruits of that baptism of fire throughout the English-speaking world.

In Part One, entitled "An Age of 'Expiring Hopes,'" we have first the anti-Puritan purge following the accession of Charles II, the expulsion of the nonjuring bishops who called William III a "pretender," and then the suppression of Convocation by George I—three tragedies which according to Dr. Bready contributed lamentably to the moral and spiritual stagnation of pre-Wesleyan England. Secondly, he shows us the Church of England at its nadir during the reigns of the first three Georges, when greed, corruption, and politics permeated the bishops and the state officers, when "bishoprics and deaneries were solicited from the Prime Minister of the day with unblushing importunity." Hence Cowper's scathing couplet

To make the symbols of atoning grace
An office-key, a pick-lock to a place.

Thirdly, the author goes on to show how the corruption of the clergy was reflected in the demoralization of society, as evidenced by the slave traffic, kidnapping, "bound labor," transportation of convicts, and in the gambling fever that made possible the "South Sea Bubble" and other get-rich-quick schemes. Fourthly, he pictures to the reader in vivid colors the period of notorious political bribery and corruption ushered in by Sir Robert Walpole, the vicious criminal laws and their administration, the barbarous prison system, the hanging shows, etc. Finally, the panorama is completed by the inclusion of a scene showing the depth to which private and public morals had fallen in "the coarseness prevalent in the eighteenth century, the gross indecency and ribaldry of its songs, of the daily and common talk which makes itself felt in the whole of its literature—in the plays, the poems, the essays, the novels . . . the grossness belonged not only to the poor wretch of a harlot, but to all classes alike." Ignorance, lawlessness, lasciviousness, godlessness, and superstition everywhere prevailed, although at the coming of John Wesley the spirit of reform was already in the air.

In Part Two, entitled "A People Finds Its Soul," we have an excellent survey of the rise and work of John Wesley. From his early boyhood, when he was miraculously rescued from the burning Epworth rectory, he felt that he had been plucked as "a brand out of the burning" because the hand of destiny was upon him, although at first it seemed as if his life would be a failure. True, his work at Oxford laid a foundation of solid scholarship, but his work as a colonial missionary did nothing to inspire him. He went home dejected. Then on May 24, 1738, he was converted and "impregnated with spiritual fire that he might set England ablaze for God." He had on that day heard the leader of the meeting at Aldersgate read Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans. "I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for my salvation," he said. Now he began to feel his way into his real work. We find him on the Continent, visiting the Moravians, attending Lutheran services, meeting Count Zinzendorf, etc. Wesley was not particularly impressed with German church life, excepting that of the Herrnhuters. Dr. Bready tells us:

After attending Sunday worship in a Lutheran Church at Meissen, he writes: "I was greatly surprised at all I saw there: at the costliness of apparel in many, and the gaudiness of it in more. . . . The minister's habit was adorned with gold and scarlet, and a vast cross both behind and before. Most of the congregation sat (the men generally with their hats on, at the prayers as well as sermon). . . . Alas, alas! what a reformed country is this!" Lutheranism, as a whole, he found rigid and frigid; and commenting on a Rhine boat trip, he says: "I could not but observe the decency of the Papists above us who are called Reformed." The pomposity, too, of German civic officials and the inhospitality of German cities toward foreigners, did violence to Wesley's expanding conception of human brotherhood. In some towns he was refused lodgings, and repeatedly he was detained at city gates for hours, being bundled, "with the usual impertinent solemnity," from one "magistrate or officer to another." "This senseless, inhuman usage of strangers!" is his designation of the treatment he and his friends received "at almost every German city." "A breach of all the common, even the heathen laws of hospitality," he again defined it. At Weimar, after prolonged detention outside the gate, he was carried before some

great man ("I believe the Duke") and submitted to a regiment of further questions. Finally came the query, "Why are you going so far as Herrnhut?" Wesley, with a droll thrust, replied: "To see the place where the Christians live."

Upon his return to England he started to preach in churches where they would admit him, at society meetings, in prisons, and finally also in open fields. Now began the great crusade in spite of much and virulent opposition, methodistic societies were organized, class meetings regulated. It was agreed "(1) That every member of the Society, who was able, contribute a penny a week. (2) That the whole society be divided into little classes—about twelve in each. (3) That one person in each class receive the contribution of the rest and bring it to the stewards weekly."

"This was the humble origin of what gradually developed into one of the world's greatest systems of voluntary finance." Nor were the class units intended merely to raise funds. They became a vehicle for the personal supervision of every member of the societies. The sexes were kept separated, intimate problems of life discussed, one encouraged the other to fight a good fight. "The stimulus afforded by these countless Class Meetings to the moral uplift, spiritual growth, educational development, and organized social endeavor of the disinherited multitudes of England, it is impossible to calculate." But the results were in consonance with Wesley's principle: "Christianity is essentially a social religion; to turn it into a solitary religion is indeed to destroy it."

The creation of local and itinerant preachers was forced upon the movement by the march of events, since most churches were closed to the Methodists. Wesley alone finally was directing some seven hundred local and itinerant preachers, and their heroism forms one of the romances of history. Of them Southey says: "St. Francis and his followers did not commit themselves with more confidence to the care of Providence nor with more entire disregard of all human means."

These preachers, who for the most part had no formal theological training, have often been decried as ignorant. However, if we look at the program of study outlined for them by Wesley, this charge will hardly hold water. Wesley not only supervised the education of his preachers, he also insisted that they become teachers of their flocks. He enjoined upon them the necessity of spending at least five hours daily in reading the most useful books, the fifty volumes of his *Christian Library* were edited specifically for the general education of his preachers, helpers, and followers. "No man in the eighteenth century," says the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, "did so much to create a taste for good reading and to supply it with books at the lowest prices."

In the chapter entitled "The Preaching of Social Righteousness" the author discusses Wesley's attitude on slavery, on war, on the use and abuse of money and privilege. He was no pacifist, but he believed war to be the "sorriest curse men know." He avers: "War is a horrid reproach to the Christian name, yea, to the name of man, to all reason and humanity. In all the judgments of God the inhabitants of the earth learn righteousness. In famine, plague, earthquake, the people see the hand of God. But when war breaks out, God is forgotten."

In the section on the use and abuse of money, an unwarranted attack is made on Luther, when Dr. Bready quotes Professor Tawney as follows: "Luther's utterances on social morality are the occasional explosions of a capricious volcano, with only a rare flash of light amid the torrent of smoke and flame, and it is idle to scan them for a coherent and consistent doctrine." To make such a charge is to confess that one is not acquainted with the writings of Luther. One need only read Luther's two Catechisms, the small and the large, to realize how well and soberly the great Reformer understood the true Biblical principles that must underlie all social morality. Some writers cannot escape the folly of belittling others in order to magnify the greatness of their own hero. Surely John Wesley was not less great because Martin Luther was greater. — Wesley's famous money rule was: "*Gain all you can. Save all you can. Give all you can.*" That he himself practiced what he preached in this respect is well known. Although his writings gave him a good income, he never retained more than a few odd pounds. All went to the needy. He never spent more than an average of twelve shillings a week on himself, wore the cheapest and plainest clothes, and dined on the humblest fare. — In the chapter "Reassertion of the Christian Ethic," Wesley's views are given on the liquor traffic, political affairs, on economics, and religion. What he had seen of the vicious liquor traffic in England made him plead for the complete abolition of all spirituous liquors for beverage purposes, as a duty of the State. The Methodists were instructed not to buy or sell or drink spirituous liquors. The preachers were strictly forbidden the use of them at any time. His social and economic teaching was based on the following articles:

1. The spiritual brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of a loving and moral God, who, with high purpose, has granted to His children a large degree of free will.

2. This free will, though necessary to the moral and spiritual development of man, is capable of dire abuse, thus causing perplexing social problems.

3. All social problems are fundamentally spiritual and ethical; and persons who fail to dedicate mental equipment and material power to spiritual-ethical ends, are enemies of the Kingdom of God — anti-social citizens, who needs must be restrained by humane law.

4. In a really Christian society, men will recognize that they are stewards of God, the Creator and Owner of all: human "possessions," accordingly, are a self-acquired delusion, and private "riches" a dangerous snare. Service, not material acquisitions, being a real standard of human attainment, fellowship, co-operation, and a truly equalitarian spirit are the genuine marks of a Christian society; wherein the strong, motivated by sympathy and love, will rejoice to assist their weaker brethren, as parents rejoice to assist their children.

5. Faith in the justice of God, in Heaven, and in the immortality of the soul, are essential inspirations of any stable, happy society: all human institutions, therefore, including those of politics and economics, must be impregnated with spiritual values, if they are to serve the highest interests of man, and fulfill the will of God.

6. If men persist in perverting the grace of free will, refusing to recognize that they are stewards of God and their brothers' keepers, then Providence *must* resort to catastrophic means to upset their vain plans and force them, in chastened mood, to build anew.

With Wesley's death came the rebirth of the English people. Says Dr. Bready:

The baptizing fire of the unique Revival he led overleapt all class and denominational barriers. It permeated the dry bones of Old Dissent and, injecting into them a pulsing life, created a new and Evangelical Nonconformity. Similarly, despite contumely and persecution, it revived vision and initiative among thousands within the National Church; while, yet more important, reclaiming multitudes of religious outcasts who long had been beyond the pale of any spiritual influence, it transformed the tone and tenor of the National life.

In Part III, "An Era of Epic Reforms," the author outlines the Wesleyan influence in the abolition of slavery in the Empire and in our country, the humanizing of the prison system, the reform of the penal code, the impetus given to Protestant foreign missions, the emancipation of industrial England, the labor movement, trade unionism, etc. He traces our American liberties to the influence of Wesley, quoting President Coolidge's statement: "America was born in a revival of religion. Back of that revival were John Wesley, George Whitefield, and Francis Asbury." While we can readily admit that there is a measure of truth in this statement, it can hardly be denied that these liberties were the culmination of principles set in motion by the Reformation of Martin Luther in the sixteenth century.

In the author's conclusions, as stated in the following paragraphs, there is much food for thought:

Materialistic "naturalism," the so-called philosophy of most modern "Totalitarianism," appeared first in England under the guise of "Deism" in Restoration times. That "philosophy," the product of a slave-trading and loose-living age, served first as a cloak for scepticism, avarice, and immorality, and later as a cause of them. In the words of Pope it glibly prated:

"Thus God and Nature formed the general frame,
And bade self-love and social be the same.

* * *

One truth is clear, Whatever is, is right."

By the early decades of the eighteenth century, this cynical "naturalism" had quite gained control of the intellectual life of Britain, while also it was practically dominant in her religious life, especially within the State Church, which then regarded itself as a branch of the civil service. Under the sway of this arid, soulless "philosophy," England's social life sank rapidly from bad to worse, till finally, by the fourth decade of that century, it reached its nadir of moral degradation. And when that nadir was reached, Church and State were in the grip of a proud oligarchy who regarded the poor as outcasts; and "the poor" to them meant all the laboring multitudes of the land.

By the unique labors of Wesley and the Evangelical Revival, wrought in the teeth of malignant opposition, this national pestilence was conquered, and the common people of England experienced the greatest Christian Renewal the modern world has known. The Revival behind that renewal was nothing less than a spiritual revolution; it created a "New England" for the common people on Old England's soil. It laid low the power of a nepotistic oligarchy and set the feet of a nation marching in confidence, amidst new and jubilant strains of Christian song, toward the goal of "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity." But these words, in a revival atmosphere, had more than theoretic meaning; they were vibrant with spiritual content, and the aspirations they symbolized were founded not on mere humanism, but on a living Faith.

Under the impact of that Revival, as a direct result of its sensitized conscience and its socialized will, came the Century of the *Pax Britannica* — the most creative period, perhaps, in the annals of man. For during that century of comparative peace, through the leaven of Christian influence, there flowered the epic era of social and political reform, when Britain was transformed from a factious, slave-trading aristocracy into a free, educated, and Christian democracy. While as for the British Empire, already planted on the seven seas, it, in this purged atmosphere, was peacefully evolving into a Commonwealth of Free Peoples, each enjoying liberty of conscience and all co-operating for common ends.

W. G. POLACK

Great Women of the Bible. By Clarence E. Macartney. Published by Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York. 207 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. \$1.50.

A preacher will find suggestions and material in this book for Sunday evening and weekday services, also for talks to his ladies society or to the young people. Dr. Macartney, minister of the First Presbyterian Church in Pittsburgh, Pa., draws valuable lessons in his biographical sketches; he also shows that in every sermon Christ can be preached, which, after all, is the purpose of preaching. For instance, when preaching on Rahab, he brings his sermon to a close by saying, "How can our faith in the Cross of Christ, that scarlet cord of mercy which God has flung out from the windows of heaven, save us from death and reconcile us to God and bless our lives with unending joy and happiness hereafter? Yet that is the promise of the Word of God. Have you taken God at His word when He says, 'He that believeth . . . shall be saved'? Is the scarlet thread of the Cross, of Christ's blood, over your soul? Is it over your home and your household? Are you concerned for that household as Rahab was for hers? . . . Is the scarlet thread of your faith in the redeeming blood of Christ waving in the window of your soul? God has made His eternal promise that he that believeth in the Lord Jesus Christ shall be saved. He will keep that promise as faithfully as Joshua did when he destroyed Jericho, but spared the house of Rahab the harlot, where the scarlet cord was waving. Is the cord there today? Are you trusting in the Cross? One day the trumpets of Judgment will sound, as they sounded of old over ancient and doomed Jericho. But where the scarlet cord waves, there is safety and refuge. 'The blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin.'" (Pages 58 and 59.)

J. H. C. FRITZ

Doran's Minister's Manual. By the Rev. G. B. F. Hallock and the Rev. M. K. W. Heicher. Published by Harper and Brothers, Publishers, New York. 505 pages, $6 \times 8\frac{1}{2}$. Price, \$2.00.

The purpose of this *Manual* — its eighteenth annual issue — is to furnish texts, sermon material, outlines, illustrative material, and prayers to preachers for the Sundays and festivals of the church year and for various occasions. That it was not intended to be distinctive in doctrine is indicated in the foreword, the aim having been "to create an interdenominational handbook." Paging through the book, one looks in vain for clear presentations of the great fundamental truths of the Christian religion. That is the chief defect of this *Manual*.

Another defect is that it presents a method of sermonizing that does not make for good Biblical preaching. The book presents short texts

and fragments of texts that lack in sufficient sermon material and fail to make the preacher and the hearer thoroughly acquainted with Scripture. The topical sermon method, which this book presents, has very little merit. It came into the Church after the twelfth century, when strict adherence to the Word of God was no longer the *forte* of the Church. Topical preaching met with much opposition for two hundred years. Phelps in his *Theory of Preaching*, p. 47, quotes Roger Bacon praying to God to "banish this conceited and artificial way of preaching from His Church." In our own time entire books have been written against the topical method and in favor of the *expository* method. Even homileticians, who in their treatise on homiletics present the topical method, point out its weakness. Knott says, "The topical sermon is the easiest kind to prepare and is, generally speaking, the least effective."

J. H. C. FRITZ

Proceedings of the Third Convention of the Southeastern District.
Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 55 pages, 5½×8½.
18 cents.

Proceedings of the Twentieth Convention of the English District.
Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 129 pages, 5½×8½.
26 cents.

In the *Proceedings of the Southeastern District* a sermon lecture by the Rev. L. F. Frerking on "Christian Education" is offered on pages 8 to 12. Prof. A. M. Rehwinkel's essay on "The Flood of Noah" is to be published in full and distributed as widely as possible in the District by the District Board of Directors, "since there is an admitted need of such material in our Church."

The report of the English District presents two instructive essays, that of Dr. J. T. Mueller is of a doctrinal nature on "The Christian Assurance of Faith in the Light of the Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions." Pastor A. H. A. Loeber read an essay on a practical subject, "The Value of the Matured and Experienced Ministry," in which he warns against the increasing practice of calling young and inexperienced men to large congregations, since such a practice is detrimental to the welfare of both the congregation and the young pastor.

TH. LAETSCH

BOOKS RECEIVED

From Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.:

No Greater Love. Daily Devotions December 5, 1942, to January 21, 1943. No. 43. By H. W. Gockel. 63 pages. Price: 5 cents per copy, postpaid; 48 cents per dozen, postage extra; \$3.00 per hundred, postage extra.

Weissagung und Erfuellung. Kurze Andachten fuer die Zeit vom 5. Dezember 1942 bis zum 21. Februar 1943. By Joh. Schinnerer. Price: Same as above.

Concordia Collection of Sacred Choruses and Anthems for More Ambitious Choral Organizations. No. 57: *If Ye Love Me* (John XIV). For Mixed Voices. By Francis Coombs. 5 pages, 7×10¼. Price, 25 cents.